Boston Public Library
3 9999 10589 507 0

PER. RM/oc

No. AP2.N7

V.110

1870

THE TRUSTEES OF THE PUBLIC LIBRARY OF THE CITY OF BOSTON 1852 1878

OMNIVM LVX CIVIVM

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

THE

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

E. P.

VOL. CX.

1961-1
V.110

Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur.

PUBLIC LIBRARY
OF THE
CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON:
FIELDS, OSGOOD, & CO.
1870.

C
NOV 10 1964

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

Per Dept
*AP2
.N7
vol 110

J. P.
246.675
Mrs. Dimmell.
Dubt 1901.1
5/24/78
3/4/12

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1870, by
FIELDS, OSGOOD, & CO.,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

222.1.110
46460

PUBLIC LIBRARY
OF THE
CITY OF BOSTON

University Press: Welch, Bigelow, & Co.,
Cambridge.

CONTENTS OF No. CCXXVI.

Art.		Page
I.	The Let-alone Principle	1
II.	Indian Migrations	33
III.	An Ancient Creed	82
	Tree and Serpent Worship; or, Illustrations of Mythology and Art in India, in the First and Fourth Centuries after Christ. From the Sculptures of the Buddhist Topes at Sanchi and Amravati. Prepared under the Authority of the Secretary of State for India in Council. By James Fergusson.	
IV.	Railway Problems in 1869	116
V.	The Ecclesiastical Crisis in England	151
VI.	The Treasury Reports	209
	1. The Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury to Congress.	
	2. The Annual Report of the Comptroller of the Currency.	
VII.	Critical Notices	224
	Pumpelly's Across America and Asia, 224. — Whitney's Geological Survey of California, 228.	

CONTENTS OF No. CCXXVII.

Art.		Page
I.	The Physics and Physiology of Spiritualism .	233
II.	Parkman's Discovery of the Great West . .	260
	The Discovery of the Great West. By Francis Parkman.	
III.	Darwinism in Germany	284
	1. Carl Vogt, Vorlesungen über den Menschen, etc. Dr. Ernst Haeckel, Natürliche Schöpfungsgeschichte. 2. Dr. L. Büchner, Sechs Vorlesungen über die Darwin'sche Theorie. Fritz Müller, Für und Wider Darwin.	
IV.	The Legal-Tender Act	299
	1. History of the Legal-Tender Paper Money issued during the great Rebellion, being a Loan without Interest, and a National Currency. Prepared by Hon. E. G. Spaulding, Chairman of the Sub-committee of Ways and Means at the Time the Act was passed. 2. Opinion delivered in the Supreme Court of the United States by Chief Justice Chase, on the 7th of February, 1870, in Regard to the Construction of the Legal-Tender Act.	
V.	Poverty and Public Charity	327
VI.	The Norman Conquest of England	349
	The History of the Norman Conquest of England, its Causes and its Results. By Edward A. Freeman, M. A.	
	Vol. I. The Preliminary History to the Election of Edward the Confessor.	
	Vol. II. The Reign of Edward the Confessor.	
	Vol. III. The Reign of Harold and the Interregnum.	

VII. Ténot's Coup d'État 377
Paris en Décembre, 1851. Étude Historique sur Le Coup d'État.

VIII. The Prospects of the Political Art 398

IX. Critical Notices 420
Ellis's Early English Pronunciation, 420. — Janus's Pope and the Council, 438. — Hazlitt's Library of Old Authors, 444. — James's Secret of Swedenborg, 463.

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCXXVI.

JANUARY, 1870.

Art. I. — The Let-alone Principle.

The seeming inability of a large part of mankind to see in what legitimate personal liberty consists is a little curious. That each individual member of society should be left free to seek his own good in the way he may deem best, and required only not to interfere with the equal rights of his fellow-men, is an idea so simple that it might be supposed that a man could not misunderstand it, whether he accepted it or not. It must be admitted that few misunderstand it in its application to themselves, when their natural liberties are interfered with. When, however, the principle is to be applied to the case of others, many advocates of liberty seem in practice to think that if they grant their fellow-men entire liberty to act as they the grantors think proper, they concede all that can be reasonably asked.

The most common misconception of the "let-alone" principle is that it is a mere abstraction, a doctrine which may answer very well in the millennium, but which is inapplicable to the present state of the world. The very opposite is the truth. It is no declaration of rights designed for an imaginary world, but one derived from our experience of the world in which we dwell. It is very easy to imagine cases to which it will not apply, and to conceive worlds in which it would work disastrously; but the application of it to men as they are has been advocated by the wisest and most far-sighted of the hu-

man race, and the general tendency of civilization is towards a more uniform adherence to it. The fact that cases may, and do, arise in which governments find it politic or necessary to violate the strict letter of the maxim, no more disproves its soundness, than our inability always to execute impartial justice between man and man disproves the value of law.

The let-alone principle may be regarded either as a declaration of rights or as a maxim of political policy. Although the result is the same in whichever way we regard it, yet the grounds on which it rests are altogether distinct in the two cases. In the first case, the principle declares that society has no right to prevent any individual who is capable of taking care of himself from seeking his own good in the way he deems best, so long as he does not infringe on the rights of his fellow-men. In the second case, the principle forms the basis of a certain theory of governmental policy, according to which that political system is most conducive to the public good in which the rightful liberty of the individual is least abridged.

In passing judgment on the principle from the first point of view, it is necessary to begin with some considerations respecting the natural rights of man, and the manner in which these rights are modified by the existence of society. The first argument which will be urged against the ethical basis of the principle is the familiar doctrine, that, in becoming a member of society, the individual gives up some of his natural rights, in order to secure more effectually the enjoyment of the remainder. The prevailing tendency, it seems to us, is greatly to exaggerate the extent of this surrender. There is undoubtedly a sense in which the individual may be said to give up all his rights to society. Practically, the individual is powerless in the hands of society, which will do with him as it pleases. He must therefore yield whatever society chooses to demand of him, and the liberty which may be left him he enjoys only on sufferance. In a sense, therefore, that which is thus enjoyed is not so much a right as a favor, and the individual has strictly no rights at all left. Such a theory of the relation of the individual to the state was not unfamiliar to the ancients, but we conceive that no one will now desire to carry the

doctrine of a surrender of rights so far. We must therefore admit that the power of society over the individual is limited by some moral law, binding on the former. When we speak, therefore, of the rights of the individual, we do not mean his legal rights, as defined by the legislative power of society, but his natural and moral rights as defined by the reason and the conscience of enlightened and civilized man.

If a man existed alone, it is universally conceded that his right to the use and enjoyment of all the objects and powers of nature would be absolute. His unrestricted use of them could violate the rights of no one. If, now, we suppose other men to exist along with him, and that they form a social organization, we find that this absolute right of the individual is, or may be, restricted in three ways.

First, in society the rights of each individual to the original gifts of nature — lands, minerals, trees, water-courses, etc. — are necessarily limited by the corresponding rights of others. Otherwise, different individuals might have an absolute and exclusive right to the same thing. The limits of their respective rights must then be determined by natural law. It is an unsettled question of natural law how far the gifts of nature should be regarded as the common property of the human race, and how far as the exclusive property of those individuals who first appropriate them. Happily, the rights of the individual with which we are here concerned are not his rights to the gifts of nature, but to the exclusive and unrestricted use of his own faculties for what he conceives to be his own good. In the presence of society this right is subjected to this limitation only, that he must not employ his faculties so as to violate the like rights of his fellow-men. Alone, he may make as much noise as he pleases: in society, he has no right to make a noise which will disturb his neighbors. Alone, he may build his house as he likes, to shelter himself from the elements: in a city he must not erect a house which might subject his neighbors to unnecessary danger of fire.

It is to be observed, however, that in all these limitations of ownership and of action, there is no surrender of any natural right. True, the individual has more limited rights than he would enjoy were he alone; but this abridgment of his rights

is in no way the voluntary work of himself or of society: it is simply a necessity growing out of the mere presence of other individuals, having equal rights with himself, and is altogether independent of social organization.

A second modification of the natural rights of an individual is effected when he voluntarily incurs an obligation to his fellow-man. He has no natural right to disregard or violate any compact into which he may have entered. His right to any object or service which he may have agreed to render to his neighbor is annulled. Nevertheless, his natural rights are not thus abridged, because, in exchange for his right in the object surrendered, he acquires from the other party to the contract some new right, which he values more highly than that which he has surrendered. It is a familiar truth of political economy, that by the operation of exchanging property or services, which is one of the most common forms of compact, the effectiveness of the labor of man in supplying his wants is increased almost indefinitely.

The enforcement of contracts in no way violates the let-alone principle, for the violator of a contract seeks his own good without regard to the recognized limitation of this liberty, that he shall not infringe on the rights of his fellow-man. Again, the act of binding himself by contract is the work of the individual himself, and not of society. It is not therefore in any sense a surrender of a portion of the rights of the individual to society, or a restriction imposed by the latter on the former.

The third limitation of rights which arises from the existence of society may be comprehended in the single phrase, "subjection to taxation." As we hold that this is the only respect in which the individual can be said to surrender any of his natural rights to society, it is important that it should receive a careful examination.

It is quite common to regard the social compact as a voluntary one. This idea, though supported by the propositions found in our constitutional Declarations of Rights, is, we conceive, a pure fiction. It is notorious that the individual is never asked to give his consent to the compact, nor allowed an opportunity to do so. The consent is taken for granted. It

may be said that consent is implied in acquiescence. But individuals are frequently found who refuse acquiescence with no better result than to be locked up in jail, or to be deprived of so much of their property as will satisfy the claims of society. No matter how consistently such an individual may, from the time he attains years of discretion, declare his independence of society, and refuse to ask the benefit of its protection, society will not allow him to redress his own wrongs, but will regard damage to his person or property as a public wrong which it will redress for him, — making him pay the bill, whether he consents or not.

There is at the present day too great a disposition to regard the will of the majority as that of each individual of the community. An idea seems to prevail that the principal object of government is to enable the majority to carry out its views. If this were so, the fewer limitations on the powers of the government the better, since they must act as obstructions in the way of the majority. But it needs only a consideration of first principles to make it plain that the main object of government is the protection of minorities, especially those most powerless minorities, individuals. The majority must, indeed, decide upon the way in which this protection shall be afforded; but this is all. When two highwaymen demand the money of a single traveller, they constitute the majority for the time being, and may, in support of their course, plead the rightful power of the majority with a good deal of force, if the doctrine now combated be correct.

We sympathize warmly with peoples whose natural rights are abridged by the government of an emperor or an aristocracy; but, if they are to be disregarded at all, it makes little difference to the minority or to any particular individual whether those rights are disregarded by a despot, a highwayman, or a majority of their fellow-citizens, wielding the powers of government. In such a case all we could say in behalf of the republic misgoverned by the majority would be, that less than half the people were deprived of their rights, whereas under the despotism it would be theoretically possible that more than half should thus suffer.

The act of forcing the individual into the social compact can

be justified only on the ground of necessity. The individual enjoys nearly or quite all the advantages of government, whether he chooses to consider himself subject to it or not. Among these advantages is the assurance of each man that, owing to the general arrangements made for the punishment of evil-doers, his person and property are comparatively safe, and equally safe whether he has or has not given in his adhesion to the social compact. This advantage necessarily costs money. If we attempted to raise the money by voluntary contribution, the covetous and penurious would try to throw as much as possible of their equitable share upon their more liberal neighbors, and failure to carry on the government would be the result. Compulsory taxation, therefore, in the present organization of society, seems to be a necessity. The individual, then, must give up a certain equitable share of his earnings for the common good; the object of thus raising a revenue being to carry on the government, to which object taxation should be confined. To go beyond this is an interference with natural rights, which cannot be excused on the ground of necessity.

Because compulsory taxation is, strictly speaking, an infringement upon natural rights, it is not necessarily an infringement of the let-alone principle, because the latter does not cover the whole ground of natural rights. There is a broad distinction between *mandatory* and *prohibitive* legislation. Government may justly command the individual to perform whatever duties he owes to his fellow-man, and, if he fails to obey, may enforce the command. Legitimate taxation, however compulsory, exacts the performance of a duty of this class. It is a command to pay a debt. The only restrictions to which this legislation is always subject are, that the duties shall bear equally upon all, that they shall be as definite as possible, and that the individual shall be allowed to perform them in the way he shall find most convenient. Should these restrictions seem indefinite, it may be remarked, in excuse therefor, that there is little or no danger of the power of mandatory legislation being abused unless it obviously violates them. In this country, at the present day, the complaint of lovers of liberty is not that government exacts too much of

them. No class will, we apprehend, fail cheerfully to submit to whatever equable tax the government sees fit to impose, in order to enable it to fulfil its proper functions. Their complaint is, that, after they have paid their taxes and done everything government dares in terms to demand of them, the latter is still not satisfied, but wishes to prevent them from doing things which they conceive to be for their own good, and which do not in any way affect the interests of their fellowmen. Their dissatisfaction springs rather from the prevailing disposition of government to interfere in contracts between individuals.

The natural right of the individual to seek his own good necessarily involves the right of two or more individuals to enter into any contract which they may severally deem fitted to promote their individual good, so long as no act under that contract works injury to any third person or to public morality. Now this right is violated whenever such a contract is either directly prohibited by the government, or unequally taxed for the purpose of preventing it, or is declared null and void. The most onerous forms of legislative interference with contracts are found in the establishment of protective duties, of usury laws, and of legal-tender laws. Let us glance at the relations of each of these classes of laws to individual liberty.

A "protective duty," as it is called, is one not levied solely for the purpose of raising revenue, but partly or entirely for the purpose of preventing, wholly or in part, the importation of the article thus "protected." The argument against such taxes is this: If you conceive it to be for your interest to buy your coat from a foreign tailor, and to pay him what he is willing to accept as an equivalent, you do not, in acting on this conviction, interfere with any right of any other human being. You only exercise your own natural right of disposing of the products of your labor in the way you judge most for your advantage, and by that act no right of your American tailor is violated. On what ground can he claim your custom, against what you believe to be your interest? You make no objection to your protectionist neighbors buying their clothes where they see fit, and repelling with all their energy the avalanche of cheap clothing which the foreign

paupers are trying to pour in upon them: why should not you be allowed the same privilege? Their claim, as a matter of right, can be based only on the ground that you were born under an obligation to buy your clothing of some tailor of your own country. It seems hardly necessary to deny that a man is born into the world under an obligation to serve, to his own detriment, the interests of any persons, save those whose relations to him create peculiar obligations.

The usury law is a relic of barbarism, the continued existence of which in this age of civilization is extraordinary. It is in direct conflict with the plainest dictates, not only of natural right, but of common honesty. If A lends B money at any rate of interest which the latter is willing to give, it must be for the advantage of the latter to pay that rate of interest; else he would not be a borrower. Moreover, A does what he is under no obligation to do, and he does it on terms more favorable to B than any other person can be found to do it, for otherwise B would borrow from this other person. Moreover, the transaction does no harm to anybody else. It therefore fulfils all the conditions of a valid and rightful contract, and government does a great wrong in stepping in to release B from his obligation. It increases the absurdity of the law, that, if A had refused to assist his neighbor on any terms or conditions, had allowed him to suffer financial ruin or whatever other calamity might have been the result of his failure to obtain the money he wanted, the law would have had no punishment for A, who would likewise have saved his money. It is like a statute making it lawful for any one to see his neighbor drown, without moving a finger to save him, but providing that if he should pull him out, but charge him for his loss of time, he should be punished.

The objectionable features of legal-tender laws generally arise rather from the construction put upon them by the courts than from anything inherent in laws of that class. A money unit of invariable value is a great desideratum of commerce, the nearest approach to which is found in a coin standard of invariable weight and fineness. A law fixing such a standard is unobjectionable, provided it govern the interpretation of all transactions in which that standard was in the minds of the

contracting parties, — and of those only. When construed to alter the meaning of contracts, such a law is an inexcusable wrong. In natural law a contract for the payment of a particular kind of money is as valid as one for the delivery of a particular brand of flour, and should be enforced in the same way; and every such contract should be construed according to the meaning of the words at the time when the contract was entered into. Under the laws in force in this country, before 1862, a contract for the future payment of money, pure and simple, meant payment of coin, and nothing else. But under the construction which has always been put upon the "legal-tender acts" of the war, all such contracts are satisfied by the payment of paper dollars. Nay, before the "specific coin-contract" decision of the Supreme Court, many of our courts had gone so far as to decide that these paper dollars were a legal tender in satisfaction of the most solemn contracts to pay specified weights of gold and silver coin. On the other hand, we have been threatened at various times with a decision that all contracts for the payment of paper money made within the last seven years could be satisfied only by the payment of coin, because Congress had no constitutional authority to make paper money a legal tender. A parallel to these constructions would be found if the Legislature of New York should interchange the names of Genesee and some other county; if the lower courts should immediately decide that all contracts for the sale of Genesee flour, though made before the change of name, should be satisfied by the delivery of flour from the new county; if all the dealers should then proceed to make their contracts by the new nomenclature; and if after several years a higher court should decide that the change of name was unconstitutional, and *therefore* that all outstanding contracts for the future delivery of Genesee flour must be filled from flour of the old and lawful Genesee County.

The doctrine of the let-alone principle respecting the power of the legislature over the currency is this: The power in question should be limited to the supply of a proper and uniform currency, in which all debts should be payable, unless it should appear that the parties had agreed on some other mode of payment. The stamp of the government should be simply

a certificate of the weight and fineness of the coin, but should not profess to give the latter any properties or privileges except those which should grow naturally out of its known character for weight and fineness.

In discussing the let-alone principle at this length as an assertion of the natural rights of the individual, we are not unconscious that it is by its good or bad results that it will actually stand or fall. We are satisfied if we have created at least a strong presumption in its favor, and thrown upon its opponents the burden of proving that the policy of leaving each individual to his natural and rightful freedom will lead to disaster. The practical question here presented is one of more importance than may appear at first sight, involving as it does the question how far individual men may be left to manage their own affairs. The real point in dispute between the friends and the opponents of free government and individual liberty is simply this: Is man a being to be taken care of, or is he able when protected in his rights to take care of himself better than any governing power, — congress, king, or parliament, — can take care of him? The advocates of universal freedom claim that, if each man is protected in the enjoyment of his individual rights as a responsible member of the community, he can take care of himself, and manage both his own affairs and his share of the public affairs better than any one else can do these for him. This proposition is denied by the opponents of freedom in government and of freedom in trade, and these two classes employ nearly the same arguments against it.

The absolutist claims that, where the political power of a government is vested in the masses, the governors will represent and themselves possess only the average intelligence and foresight of the masses; that the government will therefore be badly managed, and through its want of experience and dignity will fail to command proper respect either at home or abroad; that through the fickleness of popular sentiment and the rancor of party spirit, frequent and disastrous changes from one extreme of policy to another will result; and that all these causes will be likely at last to result in anarchy, revolution, and bloodshed: and in support of such views he can

make an effective appeal to history and to the state of contemporary republics.

In like manner the protectionist argues that, if each individual be allowed to import from foreign countries all the goods he chooses, these goods will be purchased in such quantities as to cause disaster to the industrial interests of the country. Immense amounts of labor wasted in the useless transportation of goods across the ocean, commercial revulsions arising from the drain of money to pay for the goods, even national bankruptcy from inability to pay for them at all, are among the evils which the protectionist sees arising from free trade.

If the doctrine of the protectionist is true, it affords at least a very strong argument in favor of that of the absolutist. The operation of buying and selling in such a manner as to serve the interests of the individual is much simpler than that of deciding questions of governmental policy. If, then, the citizen cannot correctly decide whether it is for his interest to purchase home-made or foreign goods, or if, when each individual decides this question on his own judgment, each will so act as to bring disaster upon all, how can the citizen be safely left to decide the more complex questions of governmental policy? If we can establish the affirmative in the free-trade question, that is, in the question whether it is safe to leave each citizen to judge for himself whether he shall use imported goods or those of home manufacture, we go far to prove that man is a being really able in all ways to take care of himself; and our faith in representative government will be greatly strengthened.

In discussing the utilitarian aspect of the question, we shall occupy ourselves mainly with an examination of the arguments which are employed by the opponents of free trade. There are, however, two propositions on which the let-alone policy, in its most general application, is founded, which we must set forth by way of introduction. They are: —

1. In the long run, each individual is a better judge of what is the most advantageous employment of his labor or his capital than any other man or set of men can be.

2. The advantage of the community is the sum of the

advantages of its component members; and therefore to prove that a community prospers, it is necessary to show that its individual members prosper, or at least that the gains of those who prosper exceed the losses of those whose condition is made worse.

These propositions will probably not be disputed if once clearly understood. We shall therefore only remark, concerning them, that nothing sharpens the faculties and dispels prejudice as effectively as self-interest, and that no one will judge so well of an enterprise as he whose pecuniary interests are staked upon it. It is a simple matter to set forth, in a general way, the advantages of this or that neighborhood for the prosecution of this or that "industry"; but the judgment of the capitalist will be sure to take into account a great many minute but necessary details which those who have nothing at stake might easily overlook.

We shall begin by trying to meet, in a general way, the argument, or, rather, assertion, of the protectionists, that, if free trade in foreign commodities be allowed, we shall import more than we can pay for without injury to our interests. Since injury to the community means only injury to its individual members, let us see who will suffer most by excessive importations, if the assertion in question be true. In the first place, it is clear that the injury in question can arise only from the necessity of paying for the goods, and must consist in the sacrifices we are obliged to submit to in order to make that payment. (In saying this, we take for granted that the supply of our wants which is effected by the goods is not in itself an evil; a proposition which will presently be considered at length.) In the next place, on whom will the sacrifice involved in payment fall? Mainly on those who have imported, sold, and used the goods. The importer acted on the belief that retail dealers would be found willing to pay him for the goods all that they cost him, with a profit. If his belief was correct, he is certainly able to pay the foreigner for them. If more goods are imported than can be paid for, it is certain that some or all of the importers must have miscalculated the demand. The punishment will then fall on those who are responsible for the excessive importations, and on them alone.

True, those who have business connections with these importers may suffer also. But this suffering is the result of the mistake they made in trusting the importers, and they suffer only the consequences of their own acts. National bankruptcy from excessive importations will mean, then, in this case, only bankruptcy of the individuals who are responsible for the importations, and of those who are directly or indirectly connected with them in business.

Suppose, however, that the goods are paid for, but at a great sacrifice. If the importers have sold at a profit, they suffer nothing. The sufferers must then be the jobbers and retail dealers, or the final consumers. If the former, they have made the mistake of overestimating the demand for the goods, and suffer justly. If they also have sold at a profit, only the final consumers of the goods suffer; and they suffer simply from buying what they find it very hard to pay for, — an evil which no one thinks in any other case of curing by act of Congress.

It appears, then, that if we grant the possibility of excessive importations, all the evils attendant upon them fall primarily on those who are individually responsible for them, and only contingently on those who have business relations with them. We venture to suggest that those possible sufferers will judge the case with far more correctness than Congress or any other body can judge it for them.

Passing to the more special reasons assigned for the protective policy, we find two to stand out before all others in prominence. Reduced to their simplest form, these reasons are, first, that foreign goods by their cheapness injure our own industries; secondly, that they cost us more than if we made them ourselves. It is necessary to consider these arguments separately. In order to see on what foundation they really rest, we shall begin by stating them in as full and clear a manner as we are able.

The first argument is the popular one. Being, however, the less tenable, its supporters very generally abandon it, or explain it away when closely pushed. At the same time, on the cursory examination which the majority of voters are able to give the question, it looks very plausible, and it is therefore the

one which will always have most weight with them. It commonly takes some such form as the following: —

We must protect our home industry against the competition of the pauper labor of Europe. Take the iron industry for an instance. If we stop the importation of this commodity, iron-furnaces will be built, the ore which abounds in many parts of our country will be utilized, and thousands of our laborers, with millions of capital, will find profitable employment in the manufacture of iron, and a great impetus will be given to the national industry. Permit free trade, on the contrary, and opposite results will follow. Our markets will be overstocked with iron from abroad, sold at rates below the cost of production in this country. Our furnaces, in consequence, will all become valueless, our smelters will be thrown out of employment, and millions of capital will be swept away. We must therefore protect our home manufactures of iron against this competition.

This argument, which is or may be applied to every branch of production that can be carried on more cheaply abroad than here, if carefully examined will be found to present us on the one hand with a good to be sought, and on the other with an evil to be avoided. The good which we are exhorted to seek is expressed in the general term "industry," and is found in the possession of immense factories, the exhibition of an unlimited amount of digging, hammering, roasting, and melting, and the active employment of great numbers of skilled operatives at high wages. This is the *summum bonum* of the protectionist. The evil we are to avoid consists in the absence of this show of industrial activity.

We readily admit that the policy proposed by the protectionists tends to increase this supposed good. Undoubtedly, if we cut off the foreign supply of any needful article, the result will be to give a great impetus to all the industries necessary to the production of that article. If we admit the foreign at a cheaper rate than that at which the article can be produced at home, that is to say, so cheap that producers can find more profitable employment for their labor and capital than in supplying it at the price for which it can be imported, that

particular industry will cease. But we meet the whole argument by denying the truth of the proposition that industry is in itself a good. It is only a means for the attainment of a desirable end, and the necessity of its employment is an evil rather than a good. In the instance we are considering, the end sought by the industry is iron. It will be observed that under either system, — the protective or the free-trade, — we get the iron, only in different ways. Under the first, we get it with a great deal of digging, hammering, and combustion of coal; under the second system, according to the protectionists, whose position we shall admit for the sake of argument, we get it without any industry at all worth speaking of. Which is the better way? This question can be best answered by carrying out to its extreme consequences the doctrine that industry and manufactures are in themselves just objects of national desire. To many the direct denial of this doctrine, which lies at the very bottom of the protectionist theory, will appear absurd. Let us then see what follows from it.

Perhaps the most telling *reductio ad absurdum* of this doctrine is found in the well-known petition of the witty Bastiat,* in which the makers of and dealers in chandeliers, lamps, candles, oils, whaling-vessels, and everything else used directly or indirectly in the production of light, are represented as petitioning the Chamber of Deputies of France for the general exclusion of sunlight from dwellings. In support of this measure they paint in glowing colors the great impetus that will be given to their several industries by its adoption. More cattle will be raised, to produce the tallow that will

* *Sophismes Économiques*, VII.: "Pétition des fabricants de chandelles, bougies, lampes, chandeliers, réverbères, mouchettes, éteignoirs, et des producteurs de suif, huile, résine, alcool, et généralement de tout ce qui concerne l'éclairage."

The nearest approach to this petition which we remember to have seen made in perfect gravity was in the case of a company engaged in the business of refining nitrate of potash, or some similar salt. When the great tariff bill was under discussion, three years ago, this company made an effort to have the crude article put on the free list, and a prohibitory duty levied on the refined article. Among the reasons urged upon Congress, in a pamphlet which the company circulated, was this: that the crude article (being half dirt) would give employment to twice as many American ships in bringing it over the sea, and thus help to revive American shipping from its present depressed condition.

be required; new meadows will be reclaimed, to feed them; the land will be planted with resinous trees; the whale-ships of France will cover the Arctic Ocean; the shops of Paris will exhibit a splendor never before dreamed of: every branch of industry will, directly or indirectly, feel the impetus thus given to production.

Grant the truth of the doctrine in question, that industry is, in itself, a good to be encouraged; suppose, also, the artificial light produced under the proposed policy to be as good as sunlight, — a supposition which inventive ingenuity might soon realize, — and the reasoning of this petition cannot be impeached. It cannot be denied that a great impetus would be given to every branch of light-producing industry, and a great increase of value to every natural product available in the production of light. As a protective tariff brings new water-powers into use, builds factories, and sets thousands of hammers and millions of busy fingers in motion, so would the exclusion of sunlight from all dwellings start up new gas-works, build factories for making every kind of illuminating-apparatus, and give employment to thousands in carrying them on.

Another parallel case is afforded by a labor-saving machine. When a machine is invented which, under the supervision of a single person, will do the work of fifty skilled laborers, the latter are immediately thrown out of employment and their skill is rendered worthless, precisely as they would be under the competition of foreign pauper labor. And, from the very same motives now presented against the importation of cheap goods, the English laborers of a century ago used to form mobs for the purpose of "smashing the machines" which were then beginning to compete with them. Even now we occasionally find workmen forming combinations to prevent their employers from using labor-saving devices, and maintaining the correctness of their action on good protectionist grounds. To them the machine is a competing pauper of the most incorrigible class. If destruction of industry is an evil, then the machine must be an evil; and if the protectionists wish to be entirely consistent in their arguments, they should oppose the use of all machinery which will lessen the sum total of industry necessary in the production of any article.

Let us, as a further illustration, take an extreme case of the evil deplored by the protectionist. Suppose some of our botanists should discover a tree which produced annually, instead of fruit, a suit of ready-made clothing. Mark the consequence of permitting the cultivation of these trees. All the tailors in the country would be immediately thrown out of employment, and the stocks of our clothiers would become worthless. They would all fail, and their failure would ruin numbers of others. The value of great numbers of our factories would be completely destroyed, and the skill of their operatives would be useless. Capital to the amount of hundreds of millions would be annihilated, and a commercial revulsion such as was never before known would sweep over the land. Then Congress would be smothered with petitions portraying the terrible character of these evils, and asking protection against them. The prohibition of the baneful trees, and the condign punishment of all who should dare to raise them, would be loudly called for.

Here is something which has the appearance of a great national calamity, of the same character with that threatened by free trade; but would it really be an evil to the country? We trust no argument is necessary to convince any reader that this seeming evil, resulting as it would in the whole country being clad without labor, would be a great blessing; and the privilege of purchasing foreign goods at a price lower than the cost of making them at home produces effects of the same character.

Here, in justice to our opponents, we remark that their theory makes an arbitrary distinction between natural and artificial products, which they may plead as a reply to these absurd conclusions from their premises. The introduction of the former they profess to favor; it is only the latter that they would exclude. Now the sunlight, the fruit of the clothes-bearing trees, and the economy of the labor-saving machine are natural products, while the goods they would protect us against are mostly the products of human art. Inquiring into this distinction, we shall find that every product which is imported in such a state that it is fit for use without the expenditure of more labor, is an artificial product to be ex-

cluded, while the products to be admitted free of duty are those which require the expenditure of labor — the more labor the better — to make them serviceable.

We shall not pause to remark upon that curious aberration of intellect which sees evil in the introduction of an article which is in a state to be useful, and good when an article is introduced which is useless without further labor; for the distinction itself is in no way tenable. The question at issue is, whether a certain effect, namely, the destruction of our industry in consequence of our markets being flooded with articles which render that industry unnecessary, is a good or an evil. The protectionist argues that if these articles are the product of cheap foreign labor and capital, the destruction of the industry is a great evil. We retort by showing that the very same evil is produced by the sun, and by every improvement in labor-saving instruments. It is no reply to this to say that the evil has a different cause in the two cases. The general effect being the same, it makes no difference what cause produces it. We might as well try to comfort a man who had swallowed poison, by telling him the poison was a natural product, as to satisfy laborers who are thrown out of employment by a labor-saving machine, that it is all right because the machine is operated by natural forces. Moreover, it is impossible to maintain the distinction. Is not copper a natural product? Yet that was not adduced as an argument against the copper tariff last session. So far as our interests are concerned, every foreign pauper is himself a natural product and a machine, just as a machine is a productive pauper.

The general question at issue may be put in a different form. What is the use of manufactures? From the free-trade standpoint their only use is to furnish us with products, and the only evil resulting from the cessation of any manufacture is that we should have either to go without the particular product of that manufacture, or to get it elsewhere. But the theory of protection is founded on the idea that every manufacture has in some mysterious way a great national importance independent of the articles produced.

To elucidate this point, let us fix our attention on a paper-mill. What is its use to the community? To supply us with

paper, will be the universal reply. But is the supply of paper which it furnishes the entire measure of its usefulness, and all that can be placed to its credit? From the free-trade point of view it is. From the other point of view it is not; but its principal claim to our favor is the addition it makes to the number and variety of our manufactures and the power of our machinery, and the employment it gives to our manufacturing industry. At first sight the idea looks plausible. To show its falsity, we have only to consider the manufactures, the machinery, and the labor to be all in operation without the production of any paper, and to reflect on the small national importance the establishment would then have. The expenditure of industry in that case would be a positive evil. The only compensation we have for that evil is the paper the mill furnishes. If we cannot get the paper without the mill, the expenditure of industry in its manufacture is a necessary evil. If we can get it from any other source whatever at a less cost, the expenditure and the manufacturing operations are unnecessary evils, — just as unnecessary as the manufacture of artificial light when we can get light from the sun.

When a public-spirited citizen visits such a place as the Paris Exposition, he cannot fail to be struck with the elaborate character of the manufactures displayed; and as he thinks with admiration of the wonderful skill they indicate, he may wonder why his own country does not produce artisans of equal skill. He comes back, perhaps, with the belief that it can, if the right policy be adopted; and he is perhaps ready to sustain any measures which promise to accomplish this result. But bring the question home to him by proposing, as a very reasonable and effective way of taking the first step toward the realization of his desires, that his own children shall occupy their lives in carving a particular kind of exquisite ornament for furniture, or in working some inimitable piece of tapestry, — and how different the view he will take of it! To arrange things so that some persons shall be induced or made to spend their lives in this way is quite to his satisfaction; but he designs his children for better employments, and it is not likely that if brought into contact with one of these skilled artisans of whom he envies France the possession, he

will consider him intellectually, morally, or socially superior to the average mechanic of his own country. Remarkable as he considers the products of that foreign skill, he will estimate them only at their value in the market, when he has to consider their practical utility. Thus the seeming desirability of manufacturing industry proves to be only the effect of the enchantment lent by distance. On a closer examination, the immense national importance of our manufacturing industry resolves itself into the immense national importance of our being housed and clad,— objects the importance of which none deny, but which may be safely left to the operation of individual foresight.

It has been, we trust, made clear that the protectionist must either give up the doctrine that industry is a good in itself, or he must accept the absurd consequences which we have shown to follow from it. He will, of course, adopt the former alternative. But if that doctrine is given up, what becomes of the great mass of popular arguments against free trade? What becomes of the complaint that we cannot compete with the pauper labor of Europe, if we do not wish to compete with it? And why do we wish to compete with it, if the industry spent in the competition is useless, except in so far as it saves us the small expense of hiring the pauper labor? What becomes of the terrors of an avalanche of cheap goods, if cheap goods are precisely what we want? Suppose they do destroy our industry,— which they may do, by transforming that industry from a necessary into an unnecessary evil,— what harm is done?

Our opponents must finally take a position directly the opposite of that which we have been combating, as in fact they do when pressed in argument. After the protectionist has portrayed the terrible evils of cheap goods, and set forth in the strongest light and with much exaggeration the extreme cheapness of foreign goods, and the consequent injury we shall do ourselves if we are allowed to buy them, if it is shown him that these supposed evils are what each man's common sense recognizes that they are in his own affairs, namely, great advantages, he finds that we have either misunderstood him or have not heard him through. We discover that it is not the cheapness of the foreign goods of which he complains, but their

dearness; that his fears are not for the destruction of our industry, but for the increased labor and therefore increased industry which the foreign goods will finally cost us. He proceeds to count up the immense cost of foreign transportation, and to show how this will all be saved if we make the goods at home.

To our reply that, unless we get the goods cheaper, after paying all the costs and risks of the transportation, than we can make them ourselves, we shall make them ourselves, and no protection will be necessary, — our opponents answer that, though this may be true when we regard simply money values, it is not true when we measure cost by labor; that though the money value which the Minnesota farmer pays for foreign cloth may be less than the money cost of making the cloth there, yet the labor cost of the wheat he gives for it is greater than the labor cost of making the cloth in Minnesota. They tell the farmer that if he will only submit for a while to high prices under a protective tariff, factories will spring up in his neighborhood which will afford him a "home market" for his wheat, at a price so much higher than he now gets that it will more than compensate him for the increased price he has to pay for his cloth. But he must still protect himself by a protective tariff against the wiles of the enemy, who, in order to defeat the success of the home manufacture, stands without, offering his goods to the farmer at a price much below the money cost at which they can be made at home. If the farmer yields to the temptation, he is undone. The home manufacture ceases, the home market ceases with it, the price of wheat falls in a greater ratio than the price of cloth, and he is started on the road to poverty.

We claim, in answer to these propositions, that if the possible effects of protection thus set forth be real, no protection will be necessary, and that the cases supposed are inconsistent with each other. To take a concrete case, let us suppose, if possible, that under the free-trade system the farmer has to give one bushel and a half of wheat for a yard of cloth, and that, when the manufacture of cloth is naturalized on his own soil, he will get a yard for a bushel. To fix the ideas, suppose the following scale of prices under each system: —

Free trade . . . . . Wheat, $1.00; cloth, $1.50.
Protection . . . . . Wheat, $2.00; cloth, $2.00.

Let us see what follows from these assertions. If it be true that, in the community in which they are both made, a yard of cloth and a bushel of wheat sell for the same price, namely, two dollars, then the money cost of production must be the same; that cost being measured by the wages of the labor expended and the interest on the capital invested. If they cost unequal sums, though selling at the same price, one of the two classes of commodities, wheat or cloth, would be the more profitable to produce, and labor and capital would be diverted from the production of the other to it, until the respective selling-prices became proportioned to the costs. Consequently, according to the scale of prices just set forth as that of free trade, the people of Minnesota would produce wheat at one dollar per bushel, and at the same time give one dollar and a half per yard for cloth, when it would cost them no more to produce the yard of cloth themselves than to produce the bushel of wheat. In other words, a clear profit of fifty per cent would be offered to the manufacturer as compared with the farmer, and yet, under the malign influence of free trade, they would all persist in farming instead of manufacturing. They would not know, with the water-power before their eyes, what business would pay, so well as some theorist, who perhaps never saw a mill-privilege, can tell them by the simple process of evolving truths out of the depths of his own consciousness.

It may be asked, cannot some other scale of prices be supposed, under which the conclusion would be different? No. Suppose any ratio of prices whatever, possible or impossible, by which the farmer would get more cloth for his wheat by a system of home manufacture than under the importing system, and it would inevitably follow that, under the latter, manufacturing would pay better than farming. If men should persist in doing what would not pay best, they would show themselves incompetent to attend properly to their own interests, and it would be better to put their entire capital into the hands of a committee of editors, who know so much better than they how it could be most profitably employed.

We have never yet met any conclusive arguments against

the general law of political economy that, when things are left to take their natural course, each "industry" and each manufacture springs up when it is wanted, and dies out only when it is no longer necessary. There is a natural growth in the manufactures of a country, and the employment of artificial means to force this growth is much like subjecting a boy to a daily stretching-process, that he may more rapidly develop into a man.

Great variety and refinement of manufacture, it is sometimes said, are the invariable accompaniments of national wealth. Suppose it were so. The same statement will apply to marble dwellings. Must the people of Pike's Peak therefore be encouraged, that is, compelled, to build themselves marble houses forthwith, that they may thus attain the highest degree of wealth? But we do not admit the truth of the proposition. If the wealth of a country is measured, as it ought to be, by the abundance of the material comforts of life which it can afford, not merely to the favored few, but to the great mass of its population, then our country is already wealthier than the most advanced manufacturing countries of Europe.

In fact, the natural wealth of our country is one of the sharpest thorns in the side of the protectionist. Why can we not compete with the cheap labor of Europe? Why have there been cases in which our raw material could be shipped to Europe, manufactured there, reshipped to this country, and finally sold at a price below the cost of home manufacture? One manifest reason is, that the rate of wages is so much lower in Europe. But why are wages lower in Europe than here? Simply because our great natural resources and comparatively sparse population offer so immense a field for the profitable employment of labor. We have millions of acres of prairie to be fenced and cultivated, interminable forests to be cleared, thousands of miles of railroad to be built, and whole States to be divided into farms and furnished with dwellings to accommodate the increasing population. Is it any wonder that we cannot compete in manufactures with countries having a population of hundreds to the square mile? Complaints that we cannot are as sensible as would be complaints of a lawyer in good practice that he could not compete with a laborer in the business of sawing wood. "Why do you wish to compete with

him?" would be the natural answer to his complaints. So, when we have such remunerative employment for our labor, why do we wish to compete with the laborers of Europe in the employments which the comparative poverty of their resources compels them to engage in? It is for our interest to avoid such competition, for precisely the same reason that it is for the interest of the lawyer to avoid competing with the wood-sawyer.

Having examined at such length the two great arguments which are constantly urged in favor of the policy of protection, it is hardly necessary to go into the long series of minor arguments found from time to time in our newspapers. We shall merely stop to speak one word of comfort to that patriotic class of our fellow-citizens who are anxious to see this country "independent" of Europe. We may very properly pronounce ourselves independent of a person or of a nation when we are able to dispense with the services of that person or nation, even though we may choose to continue to employ them. Therefore, the very fact that we can support a prohibitory tariff, without suffering any other evil than a retardation in the rate of increase of our wealth, shows that we are already independent of Europe. Poor, dependent nations cannot afford protective tariffs.

The question of the policy of usury laws we shall be obliged to dispose of quite briefly, for want of material to discuss. Most of the arguments in favor of them, if they can be called arguments at all, are too puerile to be worth refuting. The old colonial law of Maryland, still in force in the District of Columbia, was lately defended, in the United States Senate, on the ground that six per cent was enough to give for money. The senator apparently considered himself a better judge than the borrower as to how much the use of money was worth to the latter. A few years since, in an official report to Congress on the national banking system, the great scarcity of capital in the Western States was adduced as a reason why the rate of interest which might be charged by the banks should be restricted. Everybody who knows anything about the laws of business knows that the way to make any commodity flow toward any point where it is scarce is to make it profitable to send it thither, and that the way to remedy a scarcity of cap-

ital is to offer the capitalist a high rate of profit. The argument in question might therefore have been put forth with more plausibility to sustain a policy of compelling the banks to charge a very high rate of interest.

In this great dearth of arguments in favor of a legal restriction of the rate of interest, we are much obliged to Mr. Greeley for lately setting forth, in one of his papers on Political Economy, a reason for usury laws which can be appreciated. He objects to legalizing unlimited usury, that it tends to put the capital of the community largely into the hands of its more sanguine and headlong members, who will bid highest for loans, instead of into the hands of those who will use that capital most discreetly. We suppose this means that lenders of money have so little prudence that, if their operations are not restricted by the legislature, they will throw away their money by lending it to the sanguine and headlong class, who will lose it in reckless adventure. If neither party to the contract loses anything, if the ventures turn out profitable, and every one gets his money back, the good sense of the seemingly reckless investment will be vindicated, and no harm will be done. If otherwise, the losses will all fall on the reckless and on those who were so imprudent as to trust them. We are thus brought back once more to the original question, whether legislative assemblies or the owners and employers of the money are the best judges of what rate of profit it is safe to seek, and on what terms it is most advantageous to loan money. It is certainly a new doctrine that legislation is necessary to make capitalists seek sound investments.

Among men intelligent enough to see the uselessness of usury laws, it is a common remark that they are of little importance, by reason of the ease with which they can be evaded; and the indifference with which they are regarded by this class is perhaps one reason why they have not long since disappeared from our statute-books. This view is a mistaken one. It is quite true that, if the laws in question were universally disregarded, and if the opinions on which they are founded and which they help to perpetuate were banished from the minds of men, they would cease to do much injury. The difficulty is,

that they are not uniformly disregarded, and the idea that there is a taint of dishonor in accepting more than the legal rate of interest is very general in the community. The majority of capitalists have too much respect for law to think of doing an act on which a stigma is placed. They therefore refuse even indirectly to lend their money at any rate of interest higher than that authorized by law. If the effect of this state of things were, to make them lend at or below the legal rate, the borrower at least would have no cause of complaint. But for an absolute refusal to lend money on any terms whatever, neither law, public opinion, nor conscience prescribes any penalty. Consequently, if the capitalist can find any investment for his money which he deems more profitable than lending it at the legal rate of interest, he prefers this investment, however small the additional profit, and refuses to lend, however great the need of the borrower.

"I have called to see whether Mr. Blank will lend me three thousand dollars for three years on a first mortgage of my house," said a would-be borrower to the agent of a capitalist. "I can pay him eight per cent interest."

"Mr. Blank, sir, never takes more than six per cent interest; so it is useless to offer him eight."

"That, I take it, is equivalent to saying that Mr. Blank does not make long loans at all," replied the applicant.

"It is, indeed, many years since I have known him to lend on mortgage," was the reply of the agent.

The applicant left, without troubling Mr. Blank in person.

Thus entirely cut off from the great mass of floating capital, he who would borrow has but two resources, — either to go without money altogether, and submit to the consequences, or to borrow from that class who have no scruples against taking any interest they can get. Moreover, he must not only pay interest, but a greater or less percentage for the insurance of the lender against the danger of losing his claim through the operation of the usury laws. Thus the only effect of these laws is to aggravate the very evil they are designed to avoid, and to injure the classes they are designed to protect. They never enable the borrower to secure money on better terms than he could without them, but they may and often do drive

him to the pawnbroker or to ruin. Without such a law, and without the existing scruples against usury, any one who could offer good security would be reasonably sure of always being able to borrow on some terms, just as he is now reasonably sure of always being able to buy anything at some price. In the actual state of things, outside of the Eastern cities, it is highly probable that in the hour of his need he will not be able to borrow at all.

The currency question is that in which the let-alone policy runs most strongly counter to traditional views. In the popular mind money occupies a position altogether distinct from every other commodity. Imagine a Congressional committee engaged in the laborious duty of calculating how many pairs of shoes the population of our country required annually, what crop of wheat was necessary to supply it with food, what amount of fuel would keep it warm in winter, and how many pounds of quinine would be necessary to preserve it from ague. Imagine them spending the night in sleepless anxiety lest there might not be shoemakers enough to furnish the shoes, or the farmers should fail to sow a sufficient crop of wheat, or the chemists not know how much quinine to provide. Picture to yourself two legislators next morning, on the assembling of Congress, eloquently proving from history and reason, the one that fifty millions of pairs of shoes were sufficient for the wants of the country, the other that at least two hundred millions would be absolutely necessary.

At the first glance such scenes appear simply ludicrous. We should doubt the sanity of any legislative body which was found engaged in such discussions; and yet, did we not happen to know, by universal experience, that all these things take care of and regulate themselves, how different a view we should take! The opposite of what now seems ludicrous would then be incredible. Think of forty millions of people, scattered over a vast territory, every one of them requiring for his comfort and even for his existence hundreds of articles for which he is entirely dependent on his fellow-men, — distress and even death following any great failure in the supply of wheat, corn, or cloth. Each man is at perfect liberty to make what he pleases, in what quantity he pleases, and to

dispose of it as he pleases; and yet disaster follows the producer if he makes more than is required, or sends his products where they are not wanted; and distress falls upon the consumer if any one of the numerous articles is either not made, or, being made, is not brought where he can get it. If we had not tried the let-alone policy, how little faith should we have that it could be trusted in such a case! Should the wisest men in the country then argue that there was no need of a central junta to calculate how much of each necessary of life was wanted in each section of the country, to determine how this amount could be most easily supplied, and to prescribe the times and places at which it should be made; — and should they maintain that, if you leave every man to make, buy, sell, and bargain to suit himself, every single article that is wanted and can be made will be made in the right quantity, at the right time, and be taken to the right place, while at no time will there be a serious defect or superabundance; that the hundreds of people whose labor must be combined in the making of a pair of boots — from the Texas ranchero who tends the cattle, the hides of which furnish the leather, to the dealer who sells them to the wearer — would all work together in the most advantageous way; — what should we think of their argument? A serious refutation no one would attempt. If universal ridicule were not showered upon it, it would be only because we should consider the whole project too crazy to deserve ridicule. If in these matters the regulating system had ever been in actual operation, what centuries of gradual trial would have been necessary to allow the let-alone policy to be seriously thought of! And yet, what would then seem to be the vagaries of an enthusiast are truths so familiar to us that we find it difficult to put ourselves in the attitude of calling them in question.

In the face of such triumphs of the let-alone policy as these, to argue that it cannot be trusted in foreign trade, in money-lending, or in regulating the currency, is like doubting whether one who has just cast a mountain into the sea can move a mole-hill. It needs but a step more to take us to a standpoint from which the spectacle of a national legislature discussing the question of the amount of currency necessary to carry on the busi-

ness of the country, and the best way of supplying it, will be as ludicrous as that of a similar discussion about shoes. Was there not something marvellous in the views called forth by the "Specific Coin Contract" Bill from many of the honorable members of the Fortieth Congress? Suppose that among their constituents a grocer had petitioned for a law that all his contracts for the sale of flour should be satisfied by the delivery of an equal quantity of corn-meal, on the ground that enforcing specific flour contracts would lead to disastrous fluctuations in the price of that article, — would his request have been received with a grave face? Specific contracts for the delivery of any of the fifty metals known to chemists were unobjectionable, with two exceptions only, — gold and silver. Nay, if the gold and silver were to be not coined, it is quite possible that even they might have been included. If one of the honorable members had purchased a gold ring from his jeweller, and found, when the article was delivered at his house, that a greenback had been nicely rolled up into a ring and tendered him in satisfaction of his contract, even he might have voted for a specific gold-ring contract. Very different was the case if the gold was made into coin and stamped with the government mark. To enforce contracts for the delivery of that particular commodity would be disastrous!

The truth is, the let-alone policy with regard to the currency has hardly ever had a fair trial by civilized nations. It is always possible to persuade a large fraction of the public that their interests will be advanced by legislative meddling with the currency, and there are always so many persons who may make money by that meddling, that it is sure of vigorous support. Yet money is the one article which no nation having need of was ever found without. If any nation was ever destitute of a sufficient supply of money, or substitute for money, to effect all the exchanges individuals were willing to make, that fact has never been shown; and it is highly improbable that such a state of things will ever occur. Scarcity of credit is indeed a common thing, and is always called, and often mistaken for, scarcity of money; but every economist knows that the two are quite distinct. However, we are here treading on grounds so honeycombed with fallacies, that to point them out and pass

on with a sure footing would require a volume instead of an article. We must therefore confine ourselves to a brief outline of the policy suggested by the let-alone principle.

An indispensable preliminary, in the present state of our finances, is to look upon and make our legal-tender currency a debt, and not a means of paying debts. If it is deemed advisable to issue government notes, let the issue of them be regulated solely by a regard for the interests of the government, and not for those of individuals. If the latter choose to use them as a currency, well and good; but do not give them any official character as currency. Let them be redeemable in coin on demand at the Treasury, or in some other fixed and definite way, for the honor and credit of the government.

Second, take from the national banks the privilege of issuing notes not payable in coin. An irredeemable government currency is bad enough, but to have a bank currency floating upon it makes it a great deal worse.

Third, having thus demanded that the banks shall fulfil their obligations in the manner which reason and experience show to be the only satisfactory manner, release their hands, — repeal the law limiting the amount of their circulation and let them issue notes according to the demand. Repeal also the law requiring a definite and invariable coin balance to be kept on hand. If there is any danger that the banks will take advantage of these privileges, to make excessive issues, impose the severest penalties on any bank which shall fail, on any pretext whatever, to make good its obligations in coin.

The third restriction to be removed is that on the rate of interest which the banks may charge. The evils of this restriction are the same as those of the usury laws. Possibly, it may seem that, as the banks are privileged by government, it is only fair that they should not be allowed to charge the public a high rate of interest. But they ought not to be privileged. Besides, — who are the public? The banks can lend to whom they please, and refuse loans to whom they please. If they were free, they would, in a stringent money market, lend to the highest bidder who was "good," that is to say, to the man who was most in need of money, and in no danger of losing what he should get. As things stand, when the press-

ure is severe, and the demand for credit far beyond what the bank can supply, the men who get the money are not those who most want it, but Mr. A, who is an influential politician; Mr. B, who has bought the privilege by keeping large deposits; and Mr. C, who is a particular friend of the cashier. These men are the public, for the time being.

One great object of banks ought to be, to help carry the country through commercial crises, by furnishing reservoirs of credit, to be drawn upon in such emergencies. Under the restrictions in question, the banks operate in the other way. It will be borne in mind that, under our present national banking law, the banks are required to keep a certain definite reserve of fifteen to twenty-five per cent of the circulation and deposits, according to location; and if the reserve falls below this limit, they are prohibited from discounting until it is regained. Now, the very time when the reserve will fall is that of a scarcity of credit, that is, when bank discounts are most wanted by the public; so that the time of greatest want is that of least supply.

Suppose that a city troubled with frequent scarcity of water should charter a company to build a reservoir, to be supplied from springs. Anxious to prevent a waste of water, and extortion by the company, the city imposes the following conditions: first, that no water must be sold above a certain fixed price; second, that the reservoir must always be kept half full, and if the water ever falls below this point, no water at all must be sold. What would be the effect? When there was plenty of water outside the reservoir, the keeper of the latter would have plenty to sell. When it was dry weather and water was scarce, he would have very little to sell, and that only to his particular friends, to influential men, and to those who had bought the privilege. When a drought reduced the supply of water below one half, there would be none to sell to anybody.

The supply of credit which can be furnished by our banks must, under our restrictive system, operate in the same way. If any legislative restrictions, except those against wrongdoing, are to be put upon the banks, they should be in some respects the opposite of those now in operation. Instead of

fixing a maximum rate of interest, the rate prescribed should be a minimum, below which the banks should not be allowed to lend. This minimum should depend on the ratio of specie reserve to deposits and circulation, increasing with every diminution of the reserve. For instance, it might be prescribed that no loans should ever be made below four per cent, and that if the specie reserve fell below

50 per cent, no loans should be made below the rate of 5 per cent.
40 " " " " " " 6 "
35 " " " " " " 7 "
30 " " " " " " 8 "

Such a regulation would impose upon the banks the same policy to which self-interest would prompt them if they were left free. The idea of prohibiting a bank from lending below a fixed rate of interest runs very strongly counter to our prejudices; but our present law prohibits all loans under certain circumstances. Which, now, is worse for the borrower, to be told that he can have money at twenty-four per cent; or, that he cannot have it at all, how great soever may be his need?

We have endeavored to show that the let-alone policy is of wider application than many are willing to admit, and that individuals may safely be left to take care of themselves in cases where they have been supposed peculiarly to need the supervision of government. At the same time we have taken care to set it forth, not as a principle universal and necessary, but only as affording the best attainable rule of conduct for governments, a departure from which will open the road to so many complications and abuses that the best course is to adhere to it as a principle. It cannot therefore be disproved simply by inventing special cases in which it will fail. Every law which a legislature can enact is subject to the same objection. For a similar reason it cannot be overthrown by simply showing that the fundamental propositions on which the justification of it as a policy is based are not universally true. One of these propositions is, that the individual is a better judge than government of what is the best employment for his capital and labor. Let us grant the possibility of cases in which the reverse would be true, — rare though they must be. It does not at all follow that it is advisable for government to

rush in and "regulate" the business of the individual. It must first be shown that government can practically employ greater wisdom, in directing or restraining the individual as to his interests, than he can himself command, and it must be further shown that the act of interference will not bring in its train greater evils than those it is designed to remedy.

The cases in which these conditions can be fulfilled are so rare; it will so frequently be found that, after all, the individual was right and government wrong; and all interference is so apt to lead to unforeseen complications, — that the best course for a government to follow is, to adhere to the let-alone policy as a matter of principle.

SIMON NEWCOMB.

ART II. — INDIAN MIGRATIONS.

BETWEEN the years 1600 and 1700 A. D., the entire area from the Atlantic to the Mississippi, and from Hudson's Bay to the Gulf of Mexico, had been sufficiently explored by traders, missionaries, and colonists to render both the English and the French familiar with the location and condition of the several Indian nations within these limits. Some knowledge of the Dakotas and of the Missouri nations had also been obtained. But it was not until the eighteenth century that the same degree of information was acquired of the nations in the interior of the continent and upon the Pacific coast. Our systematic knowledge of the American aborigines belongs to the present century.

In a previous article * we considered the means of subsistence of the aborigines, both natural and agricultural; the centres of Indian population; and the natural highways of migration suggested by the topographical features of North America. It remains to investigate their migrations for the purpose of finding, if possible, the initial point or centre from which, in successive streams, these nations spread abroad. The addi-

* North American Review for October, 1869.

tional evidence and the conclusions must be sought in their systems of consanguinity, languages, mutual relations, and traditions, and in such actual migrations as are known to have occurred.

The aboriginal languages, north of Mexico, have been sufficiently studied in their vocables and in their grammatical structure to enable us to resolve them into a number of stock languages, which are found to be all constructed upon the same plan, and to remain in the same stage of development. But investigation has not been carried far enough to unite them in a family of languages upon strict linguistic principles. Philologists, therefore, have not claimed for these nations the position of a linguistic family of mankind, like the Aryan and Semitic families. It is very material to the further progress of American ethnology that the unity of origin of the American aborigines should be established, if evidence sufficient to demonstrate the fact can be discovered. Inasmuch as their languages are now spoken in a hundred and forty dialects, more or less, it is not probable that these will ever be investigated with sufficient minuteness, in their grammatical structure, to elicit from this source the proofs it might afford. If more than one original speech exists, that fact, however, may yet be ascertained by an analysis of a limited number of these languages.

Another class of facts, however, which may yield the evidence desired is to be found in their systems of consanguinity and affinity.* In this connection it will be sufficient to present such general results of a comparison of these systems as have a bearing upon Indian migrations. The Indian nations, from the Atlantic to the Rocky Mountains, and from the Arctic Sea to the Gulf of Mexico, with the exception of the Eskimo, have the same system. It is elaborate and complicated in its general form and its details; and, whilst deviations from uniformity occur in the systems of different stocks, the radical features are, in the main, constant. This identity in the essential characteristics of a system so remarkable tends to show that it must have been transmitted with the blood to each stock from a common original source. It affords the strongest evidence

* This subject, with the evidence, has been fully treated in a Memoir now in course of publication by the Smithsonian Institution.

yet obtained of the unity of origin of the Indian nations within the region we have defined. These several stocks, therefore, may be united into a family of mankind upon the basis of their joint possession of the same system of relationship. The same system has also been found, with more or less distinctness, amongst the nations in the valley of the Columbia, and in the Hudson's Bay Territory, and also among the Village Indians of New Mexico and Central and South America. Treating the stocks first named as of one blood, under the name of the Ganowanian family,* such nations of the American aborigines as may be hereafter found to possess this system in its essential characteristics may be admitted, upon the basis of this common institution, into the same connection. Occasional references to this system of relationship will be made in the course of this article.

The migrations of the North American Indian nations are now to be considered, — both those which have occurred within the historical period, or a knowledge of which has been preserved by tradition, and those which, from the various sources of information previously indicated, it may be inferred have taken place. The classification of the several stocks into subgroups is founded upon a comparison of dialects.

I. *Algonkin Migrations.*

A much larger area was occupied by the Algonkin stock than by any other of the Ganowanian family. North of the chain of the Great Lakes the nations of this lineage were spread from the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains to the coast of Labrador. South of these lakes, and between the Mississippi and the country of the Iroquois, they were found in possession as far south as the area between the Tennessee and the Mississippi. Along the Atlantic seaboard they were distributed from the St. Lawrence to the northern confines of South Carolina, occupying the whole of New Brunswick, New England, and Virginia, and portions of the intermediate States. They were thinly scattered throughout this immense region; but they held it free from the

* *Gä-no-wä'-ni-an.* This proposed name for the American Indian Family is in the Seneca-Iroquois language, from *gä'-no*, an arrow, and *wä-ă'-no* a bow, — "Family of the Bow and Arrow." (*ä*, as *a* in *father*; *ă*, as *a* in *at*; *a*, as *a* in *ale*.)

intrusion of other stocks, with the exception of the Winnebagoes in Wisconsin, and the Iroquois and their congeners in New York and the territories adjacent to New York on the north, south, and west. They were subdivided into a large number of petty nations, all speaking dialects of a common language, but living without unity of organization, or political relations, and without any knowledge of the order of their separation from each other. A comparison of their dialects resolves them into several groups, and tends to show that each member of each group was a subdivision of an original nation, or that they were descended from a common parent nation.

1. *Atlantic Nations.** — No movement was in progress among the Atlantic Algonkins at the epoch of their discovery. They were stationary within certain geographical limits. From the relation of the Eastern Algonkin dialects to the Western no certain inference can be drawn as to which was original, and which derived; but from the greater amount of divergence among the Western dialects, it is a reasonable inference that the western part of the Algonkin area was first and longest occupied. There is also traditionary evidence of a western origin of the Eastern Algonkins. The Mohegans, who inhabited the country between the Connecticut and Hudson Rivers, had a well-defined tradition, which was shared by some other New England nations, that they came originally from the Northwest; but they were without any definite knowledge of

---

	Localities.
* 1. Sheshatapoosh 2. Scoffies	On the northern shores of the Gulf of St. Lawrence.
3. Micmacs	Western shores and rivers of this gulf, and in Nova Scotia.
4. Etchimons	River St. John, and between it and the Penobscot.
5. Abenakis	The Kennebec, and ranging to the Saco.
6. Massachusetts. 7. Narragansetts. 8. Mohegans	These nations extended from the vicinity of the Saco to the Hudson River.
9. Montaks	Long Island.
10. Delawares 11. Minsi	Between the Hudson and Susquehanna Rivers.
12. Nanticokes	Eastern shore of Chesapeake Bay.
13. Powhattans	Virginia.
14. Pampticoes	North Carolina.

The affiliation of the four nations first named is closest with the Kenistenaux, or Crees, of whom the first two were probably detached bands.

the country from which they came. The Delawares communicated to Hekewelder a similar tradition of their western origin. Such evidence, standing alone, possesses but little weight, but, taken in connection with corroborating facts, it is not without significance. It is plainly to be inferred that the Iroquois area was originally Algonkin, and that the irruption of the Iroquois into this area explains the spread of the Algonkin nations southward along the Atlantic coast.

2. *Great Lake Nations.* — The Ojibwas, Otawas, and Potawattomies were derived immediately from each other, or from a common stem.* This fact is still shown by the close relationship of their dialects. In point of development the Ojibwa language stands at the head of the Algonkin tongues, unless the Shawnee or the Cree may dispute this pre-eminence. The country of these nations extended from the Otawa River to and along the north shore of Lake Huron, through the peninsula between Lakes Michigan and Superior, and thence into Northern Wisconsin. In the central area, at the outlet of Lake Superior, were the Ojibwas, from which point they ranged west to Ontonagon along its south shore, and upon its northeast shore to the country of the Crees. Shortly before the discovery of the country the Otawas had retired westward from the Otawa River district to the Manitoulin Islands and to the Straits of Mackinaw, where they were first known to the French; and from this region they were then spreading southward over Lower Michigan, to the vicinity of Detroit. The third nation, the Potawattomies, after occupying several localities in Upper Michigan and Wisconsin,† were then drawing southward, to the south end of Lake Michigan, near Chicago, and east of that district. At the time of their discovery the Ojibwas, who held the great fishing-place at the Sault Ste. Marie, were advancing westward upon the "disputed ground" which separated their territory from that of the Dakotas.

* The Missisagas were chiefly of the Eagle tribe of the Ojibwas. Their range was north of the Georgian Bay of Lake Huron.

† In the Memoir of M. Du Chesnau on the Western Indians, written in 1681, they are mentioned in territorial connection with the Sawks and Winnebagoes, which would place them between Green Bay and the Mississippi. This was probably their country in 1640, when the Jesuit missionaries first reached Lake Superior. (*Vide* Colonial History of New York, IX. 161.)

The original boundary between these nations was the Mon treal River and the Porcupine Mountains, a few miles west of Ontonagon; but the Ojibwas were then occuping the south shore of Lake Superior, as far west as Chegoimegon, near La Pointe. Father Allouez, however, met the Dakotas in 1665, at the head of the lake.* At the time of their discovery, these nations were receding westward.† An explanation is found in the rising power of the Iroquois at that period under their confederate organization. They had forced the Otawas westward from their original seat on the river of that name, and had attacked the Ojibwas on the south shore of Lake Superior.

A still more extended region was occupied by the Kenistenaux, or Crees. They ranged from the north shore of Lake Superior to Hudson's Bay, and from Lake Winnipeg on the west to the neighborhood of the Saguenay, east of Quebec. The Montagnars, who have been represented as holding the eastern part of this area, and of whom as a distinct people but little is known, were probably of Cree descent. With respect to the Cree language, which is now spoken in three slightly different dialects, it finds its nearest affinity in the Ojibwa, with the exception of the two Eastern Algonkin dialects, first named in a note on a previous page. The principal facts here ascertained are the establishment of the Great Lake nations around Lake Superior when first discovered, the closeness of their dialectical connection, and the southern movement then progressing in the case of two of these nations. There is a tradition still preserved among the Ojibwas that they came originally from the Northwest. It is highly probable that the shores of Lake Superior were the central seats of the Algonkin stock, from its earliest appearance on

* Bancroft's History of the United States, III. 151. "There too, at the very extremity of the lake, the missionary met the wild impassive warriors of the Sioux, who dwelt at the west of Lake Superior."

† After the separation of the three nations, a confederacy was formed among them, which they called *Na-swä'-bă-ne-zid'*, the "Three Council-fires." In this confederacy the Ojibwas were styled "Elder Brother," the Otawas "Next Older Brother," and the Potawattomies "Younger Brother." It was organized for common defence against the Iroquois, and was of modern date. Sir William Johnson, in his enumeration of Indian nations, made in 1736, speaks of the "Otawa confederacy," but includes under it other nations. (Doc. Hist. N. Y., I. 26.)

the eastern side of the continent, and that emigrants went forth from this secondary centre of population to occupy the valley of the St. Lawrence and the Atlantic coasts, and also the eastern banks of the Mississippi and its smaller tributaries.

3. *Mississippi Nations.* — This group of nations occupied the east side of the Mississippi, from the country of the Ojibwas southward to the Ohio, and south of this river between the Tennessee and the Mississippi. They ranged eastward to Lake Michigan and to the State of Indiana. By a comparison of dialects they are resolved into five sub-groups, as follows: (1.) The Miamis; (2.) The Kaskaskias, Peorias, Weas, and Piankeshaws, who appear to have been known collectively, at one time, as the Illinois; (3.) The Sawks and Foxes; (4.) The Menominees; (5.) The Shawnees. To these the Shiyans (Cheyennes) and Arapahoes, now of Colorado Territory, should be added, as a sixth and displaced member of the group.

The first two groups, consisting of five nations, who occupied the southern and eastern portion of the area just described, lying north of the Ohio, are so nearly allied in dialect as to show that they are subdivisions of one original nation; the last four nations speaking substantially the same dialect, while that of the first is distinct from the others. These dialects again resemble the Ojibwa and Otawa so closely as to render it probable, if not certain, that the nations above named were derived from the two last named by subdivision or descent. The southern movement of the Otawas and Potawattomies, before mentioned, seems to have been made upon the lines of migration of their kindred who had preceded them. It also tends to confirm the position elsewhere taken, that the great region of fisheries upon the south shores of Lake Superior and the north shores of Lakes Michigan and Huron had been secondary initial points of emigration of the Algonkin nations to the south and east.

In the central parts of Wisconsin the Sawks and Foxes were found by the first explorers, and south of them the Kikapoos. Their dialects still resemble each other, but they show such an amount of divergence from those of the Great Lake nations as to preclude the supposition of a direct descent from them. They were, undoubtedly, an early offshoot from the Algonkin stem. This last remark is equally true of the Menominees, who, when

first known, occupied the wild-rice regions upon the Menominee River in Northern Wisconsin, and the upper peninsula of Michigan.

Lastly, the Shawnees were the southernmost nation, in territorial position, of the Central Algonkins. They held originally, and before the period of colonization, the western part of Kentucky, between the Mississippi and Tennessee Rivers.* Their dialect shows a great divergence from all the dialects of the Mississippi nations. If they came originally from the Great Lake region, or, which seems more probable, from the head-waters of the Mississippi, their language indicates a separation from the parent stem at an early period. The name by which they call themselves, *Sä-wän'-wä-kee'* (in Otawa, *O-shä'-wä-noke'*, whence Shawnee), signifying Southerners, implies a previous location farther north. It seems probable that they took this name in a boastful sense, to indicate that they were the southernmost of the Algonkin nations.

There are strong reasons for classing the Shiyans and Arapahoes with the Mississippi nations, notwithstanding their territorial displacement. The original seat of the former nation was upon the Cheyenne River, a tributary of the Red River of the North, from which they were expelled by the Dakotas. In 1804 they were found by Lewis and Clarke west of the Missouri. Their nearest congeners, the Arapahoes, were high up on the Missouri when first discovered. The dialects of these nations, which are closely allied, show an excessive amount of divergence from those of the Great Lake nations, but their nearest affinity is with the Shawnee, Kikapoo, and Menominee. This fact renders it extremely probable that the original seat of all these nations, except the first, second, and third sub-groups, was upon the head-waters of the Mississippi, the area occupied by the Dakotas at the time of their discovery; and that the Dakotas not only were intruders into territory previously Algonkin, but in their progress to the eastern side of the continent dispossessed this stock of the first and most important seat occupied by them.

Whether or not the Great Lake nations emigrated from the

* They removed eastward, first to North Carolina, as is supposed, and afterwards to Pennsylvania. They were a party to William Penn's treaty, in 1682. (Harvey's History of the Shawnees, p. 22.)

South is a question hardly worth considering. It must be assumed that they were originally non-agricultural; because if they had ever been agriculturists, it would be difficult to explain the migration of the present Northern nations from districts where agriculture was known into the northern wilderness, where it is impossible. The Mound-Builders had practised agriculture north of the Ohio before the advent of the Algonkin stock, and it is not probable that the art of cultivation was afterwards lost in this area. On the other hand, the territorial and dialectical connections of the Mississippi nations, except the first, second, and third sub-groups, tend to refer the immediate original stock from which they were derived, not merely to a northern position, but directly to the attractive and desirable area for Indian occupation upon the head-waters of the Mississippi. This is the only region in the western part of the Algonkin area, except that around Lake Superior, which could have developed, without agriculture, the population necessary for the gradual formation of these nations. When forced out by increase of numbers, and finally by an alien people, they would naturally have sought the prairie area bordering the Mississippi, and a knowledge of agriculture would have become necessary to secure them a subsistence. Agriculture was practised by all of these nations when discovered, except the Menominees and Arapahoes. The whole period of time covered by the occupation of the Algonkin stock, and by their dispersion over the areas in which they were found, is not a long one in comparison with that during which the Ganowanian family had possessed North America. This is shown by the present close connection between the Algonkin dialects, the divergences among which may have required a thousand years, more or less, for their production. It is evident that this stock was recent upon the eastern side of the continent. From these and other considerations a portion of the Mississippi nations may reasonably be referred to the Lake Superior region, and the remainder to the head-waters of the Mississippi, as the centres from which they issued. A further subdivision occurred, in some cases, in their newly acquired territories.*

* *O-je-bic'*, the root of the name Ojibwa, signifies *root, trunk,* or *stem people,* whence

4. *Rocky Mountain Nations.* — Upon the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains, and eastward upon the open prairies, ranging from the Missouri to the Siskatchewun, dwell the Blackfeet, a powerful nation of horsemen, who hold undisputed sway over that section of the continent. Since the time of European colonization, a portion of the Crees, receding westward, have possessed themselves of the lower half of the district on the Siskatchewun River, where they now confront the Blackfeet; thus completing the continuity of territorial possession from the Rocky Mountains to the Atlantic coast. The Blackfoot, spoken in three closely connected dialects, belongs to the Algonkin speech, but it exhibits a large amount of divergence from all the other dialects of this stock, as well as the presence of a large number of vocables from foreign or indigenous sources. Nothing is known of the early history of the Blackfeet or their previous location. Immediately south of them, at the present time, are the Ahahnelins (*Gros-ventres* of the prairie), who also speak an Algonkin dialect. This completes the summary of the nations of Algonkin lineage.

From the foregoing brief statement of the locations of the several Algonkin nations, and of the relations of their dialects to each other when they severally became known, two important facts are made apparent: first, that the Algonkin stock still inhabit the slopes of the Rocky Mountains, over against the valley of the Columbia, thus pointing to that valley as the initial point from which they emigrated to the Great Lake region, and thence to the Atlantic coasts; and secondly, that they were climatically a Northern people. With respect to the first statement, it is sufficient, for the purposes of this discussion, to show that the Algonkins were found in uninterrupted possession of a continuous area from points within a hundred miles of the head-waters of the Columbia to the Atlantic seaboard. If sufficient reason be found, in the superabundance of natural subsistence in the Columbia valley, for holding that remarkable area to be the land from which they originally spread,

O-jib'-wa, an Ojibwa; *O-jib-wa-ak'* and *O-jib-wage'* (plural), Ojibwas. The etymology of this term, however, carries with it no special significance, as it was a common practice amongst Indian nations to call themselves "originals," and often "autochthones."

the entire course of their migrations will stand revealed. It may be observed, with respect to the second fact, that the main body of the Algonkin stock was found around Lake Superior and along the St. Lawrence, from which their diffusion to the South was nearly balanced by that towards the North. The only feature in itself peculiar, in the area occupied by them, was its elongation southward along the Atlantic sea-coast, which, as before remarked, seems to find a full explanation in the intrusion of the Iroquois within their original limits.

II. *Dakotan Migrations.*

Some evidence, both with respect to the separate migrations of the Dakotan nations, and the general direction of their advance as one of the great stocks of the Ganowanian family, may be derived from the relations of the dialects, and the geographical positions, of the numerous nations of this lineage. The bulk of these nations were strictly River Indians, which gave a peculiar character to their occupation of the area possessed by them. Since the rivers traversing the central prairies had a narrow border of forest, while all beyond was open prairie unsuitable for Indian occupation, the nations of this stock spread over great distances north and south, along the banks of rivers, without any corresponding lateral expansion. Besides, as this area, with the exception of one district, was comparatively a poor one, it created a tendency among the more vigorous and warlike bands, like the Iroquois, — who were probably an early offshoot of the Dakotan stem, — to seek new habitations in distant and disconnected regions.

1. *Dakotas.* — The Dakotas proper held a broad as well as compact area. When first discovered, they were established upon the head-waters of the Mississippi, in the present State of Minnesota, whence they ranged eastward to Lake Superior and westward to the Missouri. A portion of them were permanently established upon the latter river. They are now subdivided into twelve great bands, or embryo nations, and occupy the plains between the Missouri and the Rocky Mountains, — forced westward, as other nations have been, by the progress of the whites. Down to the time of their discovery they had remained in such intimate intercourse with one another that

their language had developed but two dialects, — the Isauntie, on the Mississippi, and the Teeton, on the Missouri; with a third, the Yankton, in the incipient stages of formation out of the first. The three forms, however, vary so slightly as to be mutually intelligible with entire facility. From this fact it may be inferred that the Dakotas were comparatively recent in this area, while the superior advantages of this district for Indian subsistence are demonstrated by their unusual numbers. When Carver visited the Dakotas in 1756, they were divided into eleven bands.* They acknowledged seven nations or divisions, as stated by Riggs,† of which the seventh, the Teetons, was subdivided into eight bands. They are now organized into twelve nations, known as Isaunties, Yanktons, Yanktonais, Sissetons, Ogalallas, Brulés, Uncpapas, Blackfoot Dakotas, Ohenonpas, Minikanyes, Sansarcs, and Itazipcos. Isaunties is a generic term used by the Western Dakotas, to designate their kindred on the Mississippi; and Teetons, another, employed by the latter to describe the former. It will be seen that the distinction is dialectical. *Dakota* in the Isauntie dialect, *Lacota* in the Teeton, which signifies *leagued* or *allied*, is the name by which they call themselves. They also speak of their confederacy as the "Seven Council-fires," from their seven political divisions. The Dakotas proper, who are more numerous than all of their recognized congeners united, are of immediate common descent.

2. *Asiniboines.* — This nation was one of the constituent bands of the Dakotas, and became detached and independent shortly before the period of European discovery. They moved northward, and became established upon Rainy Lake, and ranged thence westward to the Red River of the North, and northward to the vicinity of Lake Winnipeg. At the present time they dwell west of the last-named river, and range westward to the Missouri, and northward well towards the Siskatchewun.‡ Since the separation the Dakotas have regarded them as enemies. After a geographical separation of more

* Carver's Travels, (Phila. ed. 1796,) p. 37.

† Riggs's Dakota Lexicon (Smithsonian Contributions, IV.), Introd., p. xv.

‡ In 1862 I met a band of this nation on the Upper Missouri, below the mouth of the Yellowstone River. They are a hardy stock, but inferior to the Dakotas in character and personal appearance.

than two hundred years, their dialects are mutually intelligible, with entire facility.

3. *Missouri Nations.* — The nearest congeners of the Dakotas were the eight nations of the Lower Missouri, who inhabited both banks of this river, and the banks of some of its tributaries, from the mouth of the Punka River on the north, to the mouth of the Missouri, and thence southward upon the west side of the Mississippi, to the Arkansas. Their dialects are distinct from each other, but may be resolved into three groups: 1st, That of the Punkas and Omahas, the northernmost nations, whose dialects, although greatly divergent, are more nearly allied to each other than either is to any of those remaining. These nations are probably subdivisions of one original band. South of them, upon the Missouri, and ranging over Iowa, were the Iowas, Otoes, and Missouris, whose dialects likewise are more nearly related to each other than to those remaining. These nations also were probably subdivisions of one original nation. South of these were the Kaws, Osages, and Quappas, who were in like manner subdivisions of one nation, as is shown by the relation of their dialects. The Osages have a tradition that they once occupied the east bank of the Mississippi, south of the Ohio, in what afterwards became the Shawnee area; and that while there the Quappas separated from them, and emigrated to the mouth of the Arkansas,* where they were found by De Soto, in 1540.† All of the Missourian nations have changed their seats, from time to time, within their modern areas. The Kaws, when first known to explorers (under the names of Okames and Kansas), resided upon the Kansas River; but they were formerly established, as one of their chiefs informed the writer in 1859, upon the west bank of the Mississippi, a few miles above the mouth of the Missouri. Their village, at this point, was called *Ne-bla-zhe-tä'-mä*, which signifies the "blue river," and this was their name for the Mississippi; whilst they called the Missouri *Ne-sho'-ja*, the "muddy river." These eight nations, as before stated, were probably derived from three original nations by subdi-

* Report of William Clarke and Lewis Cass to the Secretary of War, in 1825. Schoolcraft's History, Condition, and Prospects of the Indian Tribes, III. 594.

† Bancroft's Hist. U. S., I. 54; Schoolcraft's, III. 594.

vision, and the three again from one; but the degree of the divergence of their dialects from each other, and from the Dakota, indicates a long period of separate national existence.

4. *Winnebagoes.* — In intimate connection with the Missouri nations, dialectically, must be placed the Winnebagoes. They were first known as Puants, and ranged from Lake Winnebago to Green Bay in Wisconsin. They were an early offshoot from the Dakotan stock, which advanced eastward into the forest area; and their progress seems to have been arrested by Lake Michigan, and very likely by the nations in possession of the narrow peninsula between Lakes Michigan and Superior. This was the natural route of migration to the St. Lawrence valley from the Missouri and Mississippi regions.

When an original stock subdivides, and the process is repeated from century to century, it becomes impossible to ascertain which was the parent nation. They are, in effect, the common descendants of this original stock, which exists only in its branches. That branch only from which a particular nation is immediately derived stands to the latter in the relation of a parent. While this would be true, as to each band emigrating from the territorial and political connection of the mother nation, the constitution of Indian society tended to subdivision as the people spread abroad over larger areas. It is evident, from the relations of the dialects of the nations we are considering, that the Missouri nations were not derived from the Dakotas. Neither can the latter, nor the Winnebagoes, be derived from either of the former; but each is a branch of a common stem back of them all in point of time. There was a definite order of separation, but it is not now ascertainable. The Winnebagoes affirm that the Missouri nations were descended from them.

5. *Upper Missouri Nations.* — North of all the nations we have named on the Missouri were the Mandans, who speak a dialect of the Dakotan stock language, and also the Minnitarees, and Crows (*Ab-sar'-o-kas*), whose dialects have so large an infusion of Dakotan vocables that they are believed to be an offshoot of this stock, or rather of common descent with them. The Mandan dialect appears to be more advanced than any other of the Dakotan stock, unless the

Dakota proper is the superior. Any person familiar with the articulation of Indian languages can form a very correct opinion of their development when heard from the lips of native speakers in council. The Mandan, as used by the chiefs in formal addresses, is a clear sonorous language, with quantity and accent strongly defined; but it is disfigured with scraping and guttural sounds. It could not have attained its degree of advancement without a long and prosperous national career. This dialect is in closer affiliation with those of the Lower Missouri nations than with the Dakota proper; at the same time, judging from a comparison of vocables, it resembles the latter more closely than the latter does the Missouri dialects, thus giving to the Mandans an intermediate position. The Minnitarees and Crows, who are subdivisions of an original nation, seem to form a connecting link between the Dakota and Missouri nations on the one hand, and the Gulf nations, namely, the Creeks, Choctas, Seminoles, etc., on the other. In their dialects they must be classed with the former, but in their system of consanguinity with the latter. There is a concurrence, in one striking feature, of their respective systems of relationship, which is found in their systems alone, and which seems to require a connection by blood for its explanation. It has elsewhere been stated as probable that the Minnitarees carried agriculture to the Upper Missouri and taught it to the Mandans and Arickarees, and that they were emigrants from the South. The remembrance of this migration seems still to be preserved in their national name *E-năt'-zä*, signifying "the people who came from afar."

It thus appears that the nations of Dakotan lineage held a territory, when first discovered, substantially continuous through thirteen parallels of latitude, that is, from the Arkansas River to Rainy Lake; and, in the upper part of the area, of several hundred miles in width. There is no direct evidence, either from tradition or other sources, as to the country from which they came. Their subdivision into the existing nations occurred, presumptively, after they became possessed of this area, or else they must have followed each other at short intervals from a common original seat; — in either case, after the Dakotan stock language had become distinct. So much may

be inferred from the present relation of its dialects, of which fifteen have been enumerated, and also from the continuity of their territorial possessions. The initial point from which they migrated into this area was necessarily remote; for they held an isolated position in the midst of the central prairies, and in precisely that portion of North America which would be occupied last in point of time by non-agricultural nations.

On the assumption that the Ganowanian family originated outside of the American continent and reached it in pre-historic ages, there are no facts of positive weight pointing to a European or African source. There were no people on either of these continents of the same or even similar type, from whom they could have been derived; consequently there is no occasion to include, as supposable, an hypothesis of their spread westward from the Atlantic coast. On the contrary, there are weighty, even conclusive indications that they commenced their dispersion over North America from the northwest coast. Their migrations, retraced to the valley of the Columbia, seem next to point back to the Asiatic continent, with which there are two possible routes of connection, and which still contains within its borders nations of a type strikingly similar to theirs.*

With respect to the Dakotan stock, the original home of their ancestors must, of necessity, be referred to the western side of the continent. There were but three routes through the prairie area available: first, by the Siskatchewun, from the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains to Lake Winnipeg, and thence south by the Red River of the North to the head of the Mississippi, — a distance of fifteen hundred miles; second, by the Platte River, from the same mountains to the Missouri, — a distance of about eight hundred miles, nearly all the way through open prairies; and third, by the Arkansas River to the Mississippi, about the same distance, and through a similar region. A migration by the Siskatchewun or by the Arkansas is far less probable than by the Platte. If by the first, it

* I have recently seen a photograph of a Mongolian woman whose face and features resemble those of Seneca-Iroquois females so closely that one might be taken for the other if they stood side by side.

would seem necessary to derive the Missouri nations from the Dakotas; if by the second, the reverse: and both of these suppositions present linguistic difficulties. But if they reached the Missouri by way of the Platte, and spread thence northward and southward along the former river, and eastward to the sources of the Mississippi, into the several areas in which they were found, their movements would seem to have been more in accordance with their present relations. This supposed route is rendered probable by other facts. The Dakotan stock were, climatically, a Northern people, and, with the exception of the Quappas, and, to a limited extent, of the Osages and Iowas, also non-agricultural. Had they reached the Mississippi as low down as the Arkansas, they would have come in contact with the Gulf nations, who were agricultural in their habits when first discovered by De Soto in 1540; and would themselves have become agricultural, as the Quappas did at a later period, from their geographical position. That the latter nation was a recent arrival upon the Arkansas in 1540 is shown by the Osage tradition before referred to. If the Dakotas had been acquainted with the art of cultivating the ground, and afterwards migrated to their northern location, they would probably not have abandoned the advantages to be derived from it. There is another class of facts bearing upon this question. At the time Marquette descended the Mississippi, in 1673, a portion of the Mississippi Algonkins resided on its west side, near the mouth of the Des Moines River in Iowa, whence they were afterwards expelled. The Kithigami, an Algonkin people, are located on Marquette's map upon the west side of this river, from which they afterwards retired.* Whether this occupation was an encroachment upon areas previously Dakotan, or indicates that this region was then a part of the Algonkin domain, cannot be determined with certainty. It seems most probable that the latter was the case, and that the Dakotan stock wrested this area, as well as their principal seat in Minnesota, from the Algonkins. When the Dakotas were discovered, in 1665, they were attempting to gain a foothold in the forest area on the south shore of Lake

* Bancroft's History of the United States, III. 160.

Superior; and the Winnebagoes, as elsewhere stated, had penetrated the Algonkin area as far eastward as Lake Michigan, and were then surrounded by Algonkin nations.

There is still another significant fact, in the name of the Shiyans, and of the river upon which they dwelt. They were formerly established in Dakota territory on the great bend of the Cheyenne River, a tributary of the Red River of the North, from which they were expelled by the Dakotas. Their name was bestowed on them by the latter, who called them *Shi-yä*, "people of an unintelligible tongue." They also called the river *Shi-yä wo-zu'-pe*, the last word signifying *plantation* or *garden*. Since the Shiyans are of Algonkin lineage, if the Dakotas had emigrated from the North or East, the Shiyan language would not have been new to them, and much less so strange as to have elicited such a name; and if from the South, planting or garden-beds would not have been such a novelty as to have found expression in this way. On the contrary, from well-known Indian idiosyncrasies in bestowing names, had the Dakotas, advancing eastward from Nebraska toward the Mississippi, heard for the first time the Algonkin speech from the Shiyans, and on their river witnessed for the first time the cultivation of the earth, these names, or something equivalent, — it might have been predicted, — would be applied to them.

It seems therefore extremely probable that the Dakotan stock commenced the occupation of their modern area at some point on the Missouri as high up as the mouth of the Platte, from which they advanced northward, southward, and eastward, and subdivided into independent nations, as they increased in numbers and dwelt apart from each other. With this conclusion established, a prior migration from the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains, by way of the Platte River and the Black Hills of Nebraska, becomes a necessary inference, although the safe transit of a band of Indians by this or any route through the prairies must have been a happy accident. The next preceding movement connects them with the valley of the Columbia. This general conclusion will be materially strengthened by the facts bearing upon the migrations of the remaining stocks.

6. *Hodenosaunian Nations.* — This group consists of the

five Iroquois nations (Senecas, Cayugas, Onondagas, Oneidas, and Mohawks), the Hurons, or Wyandotes, Eries, Neutral Nation, Susquehannocks, Nottowas, and Tuscaroras.

The earlier home of the Iroquois, before they occupied New York, was upon the north bank of the St. Lawrence, in the vicinity of Montreal.* Their last migration, of which they have a clear tradition, was from that district into the lake region of Central New York, where they had been established for at least a century and a half when first discovered, in 1608. The Hurons remained in Canada, and were found on the Georgian Bay of Lake Huron, around Lake Simcoe, and ranging southward toward Lake Erie. The Wyandotes, now of Kansas, are the remains of the ancient Hurons. Upon both banks of the Niagara River, and ranging westward along the northeast shore of Lake Erie, was the Neutral Nation, probably a subdivision of the Hurons. On the southeast shore of Lake Erie were the Gakwas, or Eries, supposed to have been a subdivision of the Senecas. Both the Neutral Nation and the Eries were defeated and expelled by the Iroquois about 1650–1655, and are now extinct. The Susquehannocks lived on the banks of the lower Susquehanna, in Pennsylvania, and the Nottowas on the river of the same name in Virginia. These nations are also extinct. Upon the Neuse River, in North Carolina, were the Tuscaroras, who, upon their expulsion, in 1712, moved northward to the country of the Iroquois, and were admitted as a sixth nation into the Iroquois confederacy. Of the dialects of these nations the Tuscarora was the most divergent, but they were all closely affiliated.

It will be noticed that these nations are classed as a sixth branch of the Dakotan stock. There are strong reasons for assigning to them this position. Notwithstanding the general conclusion that the Hodenosaunian speech is a distinct stock language, a comparison of its several dialects with those of the Dakotan nations shows that if the words do not reach the point of clear identification, they have, nevertheless, a strong family likeness so plainly marked as to arrest attention, whilst corresponding words from Algonkin dialects are in striking contrast. Their respective systems of relationship are more nearly identical in minute details than those which belong to indepen-

* League of the Iroquois, p. 5.

dent stocks. Among the Wyandotes there is a tradition that the Dakotas were derived from them, which is equivalent to a tradition of common descent.* They still recognize each other as *brothers*, which is a recognition of blood-relationship when applied by one Indian nation to another.† There is some evidence to the same effect in the common name applied by the Algonkin nations to the Iroquois and to the Dakotas. It gains importance from the fact that the Algonkin and Dakotan nations have confronted each other during the centuries of their occupation of conterminous areas, and have been mutual witnesses of each other's subdivision and changes of location. The Great Lake nations call the Iroquois *Nä-do-wage'*, which signifies *marauders*. It has a primary meaning equivalent to enemy, but it was applied to the Iroquois, as a specific national name, by the Algonkin nations. It was also their name for the Hurons, although the latter, while residing upon Lake Huron, were in alliance with the Ojibwas and Otawas, and made common cause with them against the Iroquois. It is still applied to the Wyandotes. Moreover the name Nottowas, given to a small nation of the same lineage, in Virginia, who called themselves *Che-ro-ha'-kă*, confirms the view that this term

* This tradition was communicated to the writer in 1859, at the Wyandote reservation in Kansas, by Matthew Walker, an educated half-blood Wyandote, who had lived among the Dakotas. He accepted the tradition as true. The war-dance of the Iroquois was obtained by them of the Dakotas, and is still called the Dakota dance. *Wä-sä'-sa-o-no* is their name for the Dakotas, and *Wä-sä-sa'*, for the war-dance.

† An investigation of the terms by which Indian nations address each other would lead to valuable historical results. They generally use these terms in such a way as not only to imply blood-relationship, but also relative equality, inferiority, or superiority in age as nations. Thus the Dakotas and Wyandotes call each other *Brothers*, thereby admitting equality as well as kin. The Missouri nations call the Winnebagoes *Uncles*, by which they recognize a common descent, and admit that the Winnebagoes are an older branch of the same stem. The Great Lake Nations call the Shawnees *Uncles*, thus acknowledging their superior rank as well as greater age. It seems to imply that the former separated from the main stock, possibly in Minnesota, when they took up their residence at the foot of Lake Superior. Most of the Algonkin nations call the Delawares *Grandfathers*, thus recognizing their greater age as a nation, and implying descent from them as the mother nation. On the contrary, the Iroquois called the Delawares *Nephews*, although belonging to a different linguistic stock. It was used in this case to express inferiority and the fact of their subjugation. The Mohawks, Onondagas, and Senecas called each other *Brothers*, and called the Oneidas, Cayugas, and Tuscaroras *Sons;* while the last three called each other *Brothers*, and called the first three *Fathers*.

was a generic one among the Algonkins for this particular stock. In the next place, the French first learned of the existence and name of the Dakotas proper through the Otawas and Ojibwas, and from French sources came the name Nadoüessi, or Naudouescioux, whence probably the name Sioux, by which the Dakotas were first known. To the early English explorers the same name was given, and written Naudowissies. It is evident that the Ojibwa *Nä'-do-wä* was the root of both terms.* Whilst the strength of the argument in favor of a direct blood-relationship between the Iroquois and Dakotas, from the application of this term to both, is weakened by its etymological signification, it is not overthrown. The force of the term is not exhausted by the fact that these nations, as aliens in speech, were, for that reason, both enemies of the Algonkin stock. These great branches of the Ganowanian family had long confronted each other, and it seems a reasonable supposition that a name applied originally to the Dakotan stock would be continued to each of its subdivisions as they occurred, thus preserving a knowledge of their blood-connection.

From what quarter the Hodenosaunian nations entered the Algonkin areas, there is neither positive knowledge nor tradition. It seems at least probable that they were an advanced band or offshoot of the Dakotan stem, who worked their way through the narrow peninsula separating Lakes Michigan and Superior, and thence to the valley of the St. Lawrence, where their traditional history commences. It seems also not unlikely that the Winnebagoes were following on the same general line, and striving to enter the forest area, when their further progress eastward was arrested by the superior power of the nations which held this peninsula. Both migrations antedate, probably, the occupation of Minnesota by the Dakotas. The aborigines progressed slowly in these movements, living upon the territory they inhabited, and, if this was poor and unfavorable, constantly striving for the possession of a better area. Centuries might elapse before a Missouri nation, moving eastward,

* Now, there is a slight difference made in the two terms. In Ojibwa, *nä-dink'* signifies "the act of getting"; *nä-yä'-do-wa*, "one who comes stealthily and takes"; whence *Nä'-do-wa*, an Iroquois = a marauder; *Nä-do-wage'* (plural), Iroquois; *Nä-do-wa-see'*, a Dakota; *Nä-do-wa'-see-wug'* (plural), Dakotas.

would have become established on the east side of the Mississippi, which formed a great natural barrier; and still other centuries, with many changes of location, before the same nation would reach the valley of the St. Lawrence. The valley of the Ohio, and particularly the region between that river and Lake Erie, so poorly supplied with fish, seems to have been avoided by the Roving Indians. Not until after European colonization had commenced did the Iroquois extend their occupation over this area, as far west as Indiana, although agricultural in their habits. Migrations eastward over the territory between the Ohio and Lake Erie were therefore extremely improbable.

III. *Migrations of the Gulf Nations.*

Philologists have recognized five stock languages among the nations inhabiting the regions, east of the Mississippi, between the Ohio and Neuse Rivers — which may serve for the northern boundary — and the Gulf of Mexico. These are the Catawba, the Natches, the Uche, the Creek, and the Cherokee.

Of the Catawba, there is but one vocabulary published, and that a scanty one. Of the existence of anything beyond this the writer is not aware. The conclusion that it is a distinct stock is, therefore, a negative one. A comparison of this vocabulary — which is found in the Mithridates, and also in Gallatin's collection — with those of the Dakotan dialects discloses strong similarities, rising in some words to the point of identity. It is not improbable that it will ultimately be found to be a dialect of that stock language.

Neither the Uche nor the Natches language has been investigated sufficiently to demonstrate its independent position. The Uches, and the remains of the Natches who survived their overthrow by the French, became afterwards, and are now, constituent members of the Creek confederacy. This fact alone tends to prove a remote connection by blood with the Creeks, although it is not conclusive.

The dialects of the Creek language are the Muscoke, or Creek proper, the Seminole, the Alabama, the Chocta, and the Chickasa. The last two are subdivisions of one nation, and the Seminoles are an offshoot from the Creeks, of no ancient date.

The Cherokee, which is spoken in two dialects, and has

been thoroughly investigated, has some affinity with the Creek, and also with the Iroquois, but it still holds the position of an independent stock language. Concerning the migrations of these nations, and of the small bands west of the Mississippi, along the northern shores of the Gulf, no knowledge is preserved. It is only by ascertaining their connection with nations whose migrations are traceable, that this knowledge can be recovered. We can only say that such of them as possess, in reality, independent languages, are presumptively the earliest occupiers of the country east of the Mississippi.

IV. *Migrations of the Prairie Nations.*

The Pawnees and Arickarees speak closely allied dialects, and are subdivisions of an original nation. When first known, the former nation occupied in four divisions the upper waters of the Kansas, and ranged from there to the Platte River. They were numerous and powerful for an Indian nation. After their separation, the Arickarees emigrated to the Upper Missouri, near the Mandans, where they became agricultural, and stationary in villages. Neither they nor the Pawnees ever lived east of the Missouri.

The only known congeners of the Pawnees and Arickarees are the Huecos, Witchitas, Keechies, and Towaches of the Canadian River, and of the Red River of Arkansas. They speak dialects of the same stock language. All these nations have been Prairie Indians since they were first known to the whites, and they have been able to occupy the prairies — subsisting upon the buffalo — through the possession of horses. This branch of the Ganowanian family is thus referred by its known past history to the Rocky Mountain chain, near the head-waters of the Arkansas River, along which, in all probability, they traversed the prairies into their modern areas. The line of their migration, which was undoubtedly subsequent both to the Algonkin and Dakotan, points to the valley of the Columbia as its starting-point.

V. *Shoshonee Migrations.*

The nations speaking dialects of the Shoshonee stock-language are the Shoshonees, or Snake Indians, in subdivisions,

who now inhabit Lewis's Fork of the Columbia River, and range southward to the Humboldt River, and eastward to the Wind River Mountains; the Utes, in several subdivisions, who inhabit the territory of Utah, from the region of Great Salt Lake southward to New Mexico, and the west side of the Colorado as far south as Arizona; the Comanches of Texas; and the Cawios, Netelas, and other small bands in the peninsula of Lower California. In this stock of the Ganowanian family, the Shoshonees and Comanches are the most conspicuous in number, influence, and character. The former, since their discovery, have held the same area substantially, although a portion of them, according to a tradition of the Crow Indians, occupied, several centuries ago, the head-waters of the Yellowstone River, from which the Crows displaced them. The Comanches, called at different times Paducas and Hietans, have been known from an early period. It is within a century, however, that they have come into prominence. Mountaineers originally, they became Prairie Indians through possession of the horse, and have far outstripped all of their congeners in number and intelligence. At the time of Coronado's expedition to New Mexico, in 1540, if they were met with at all by those adventurers, which is not certain, they were a feeble and inconsiderable nation. When first known to Americans they ranged northward to the Arkansas, and beyond into Kansas, and southward through the western part of Texas, well towards the Gulf of Mexico.

In some respects the Shoshonee migration is more significant than that of any other stock of the Ganowanian family. Its course is still manifest, as well as the precise region in which it took its rise. The greater part of the area overspread is still held by nations of the Shoshonee speech. It extends from the principal branch of the Columbia southward, to the Colorado, where it divides into two streams: one, turning southeasterly, and migrating apparently by way of the Arkansas, reached Texas; while the other, keeping west of the Colorado, flowed southwesterly, until its most advanced bands penetrated Lower California, — the two extremes being a thousand miles apart from east to west. There is no doubt whatever that the initial point of this migration was in the valley of the Columbia,

where a greater abundance of the means of subsistence than was to be found in other areas favored a rapid increase of numbers; this surplus population being constantly forced outward by subdivisions resulting from the nature of their institutions. This statement will serve to illustrate the manner in which Indian migrations probably proceeded. The people, flowing out from a permanent centre of population, spread, slowly and step by step, over a continuous area, which they strove to hold, and did retain until they were displaced by other emigrants. After portions of a particular stock had become separated by intervening and hostile nations, there was a strong tendency in the separated parts to reunite, by abandoning one of the areas and removing to the other. Thus their territorial positions were constantly shifting. A common language was the bond of peace, and the means of confederation for mutual protection; whilst differences of language in nations confronting each other were the prolific source of interminable warfare. It is not unlikely that successive stocks had occupied the Dakotan and Algonkin areas before the appearance of the latter on the Missouri and the Great Lakes, and that many nations perished or were absorbed in the struggles of Indian nations with each other for the possession of particular areas. The Shoshonee migration was going on at the time of European discovery, and was consummated within the historical period by the development of the Shoshonee nation in the present Territory of Idaho, and of the Comanche power in Western Texas. Their possessions were still substantially continuous and unbroken, and stretched back to the valley from which the stream had flowed. It was in the order of time the last stock language which, having become distinct in the valley of the Columbia, flowed out from that fruitful nursery of tongues, and took its place in the Ganowanian family of languages in distant parts of the continent, — a language certainly the most opulent, in the number of its dialects, ever developed by any portion of the human family.

Four definite streams — the Algonkin, the Dakotan, the Pawnee, and the Shoshonee — have now been considered, all of which seem to proceed from the valley of the Columbia as their original source. In point of time the Algonkins apparently held the advance in the eastern movement, and were

thus able to follow the isothermal line, by way of the Siskatchewun, to the Great Lake region, and thence to the valley of the St. Lawrence; while the Dakotas, striving to move in the same general direction, took a more southern route, by way of the Platte; and the Pawnees and Shoshonees, moving still later, followed a route still farther south. This, at least, seems to be the most probable solution of the order and course of these migrations.

VI. *Athapasco-Apache Migrations.*

The Athapascans, who inhabit the Hudson's Bay territory, and the Apaches and Navajoes of New Mexico, speak dialects of the same stock language. Their migrations present the remarkable spectacle of a stock dividing in some central area, one branch moving northward and becoming established in a nearly arctic climate, and the other moving southward into a semi-tropical region; and illustrate the truth that the habitat of man is coextensive with the earth; his superior and flexible organization enabling him to become arctic or tropical in his habits, as circumstances may direct his migrations.

We are indebted to the late Professor W. W. Turner for the identification of the two great branches of this stock. The evidence, which is derived from a comparison of vocables, clearly establishes the fact.* The northern branch consists of the Cheppeyans, Hares, Dog-Ribs, Beavers, Red-Knives, Acheotennes, Kŭchin (Koo-tchin'), Mountaineers, and some other bands, east of the Rocky Mountains; and the Tacullies, Umkwas, and Hoopahs, west of those mountains; as well as several small nations in Alaska. The southern branch is formed by the Apaches in several subdivisions or embryo nations (Lipans, Miscaleros, Jicarillos, Coyoteros, and some other bands), who occupy an extensive district of country, from the ranges of the Comanches on the east nearly to the Gulf of California on the west, — including the northern parts of the Mexican states of Chihuahua and Sonora, and the parts of New Mexico not occupied by the Village Indians. In the northern part of the latter Territory are the Navijoes and Pinols, who belong to the

* Explorations for a Railroad Route, etc., to the Pacific, Vol. III., Report on Indian Tribes, page 84.

Apache stock.* The Apaches did not come into notice until after they obtained the horse, which has raised many Indian nations from obscurity. They were mentioned by Father Kino in 1694. At the time of Coronado's expedition, before referred to, they were probably in possession of some part of these regions as wild bands.†

In the migrations of this stock a fifth stream is recognized, — earlier in point of time than the Shoshonee, and probably later than the Algonkin, — which divided at some point between the two extremes in which they were found, and moved in opposite directions. The only intermediate region to which they can be referred as the place of their origin is the valley of the Columbia. It is a further and important confirmation of the superior claims of this valley, over the remainder of the continent, to be regarded as the nursery of the Ganowanian family.

VII. — *Migrations of the Village Indians.*

1. *The Village Indians of New Mexico and Arizona.* — Without a doubt, the valleys of New Mexico and Arizona have been the seats of the Village Indians from a very ancient date. This view is sustained by the number and position of the present pueblos, by the ruins of deserted pueblos surrounded with traces of cultivation, and by the number of stock languages still spoken in these limited areas. There are some reasons, derived from the number and extent of the pueblos in ruins in New Mexico and on the San Juan, and on its northern tributaries in the southern part of Utah, for supposing that Village Indian life in this region was in a state of decadence at the time of its discovery. It seems probable that the more northern Village Indians had been overpowered and forced southward by the roving nations. For upwards of three centuries the Pueblo Indians, as they are called, have been known to us, and have remained substantially in the same condition; but of their previous history and movements there exists no

* Gregg's Commerce of the Prairies, I. 285.

† For a Spanish account of the Apaches in 1799, *vide* Report of Don Jose Cortez (Explorations for a Railroad Route, III. 119). Cf., also, Report of M. Steck (President's Message and Documents, 1859, I. 712); and Report of E. A. Graves (Ibid., 1854, 1855, I. 385).

knowledge. No connection has as yet been discovered between their languages and those of the Northern or Southern Indians. Their village life probably commenced with the introduction of agriculture into this region. It is not necessary to assume that they migrated from the South and carried agriculture with them, in order to explain its presence in New Mexico, any more than it is, to infer that the Shiyans and Hurons emigrated from the Gulf region into the Dakota Territory and Canada, to explain their knowledge of agriculture. In many ways the art of cultivating the ground would spread from place to place by the mere accidents of aboriginal life, as well as though deliberate efforts made for its acquisition. It would be a fatal error to adopt the track of agriculture as the line of original migration. Indian agriculture must have originated in a tropical climate, from the nature of the cereal upon which it rested, and long after both North and South America had become peopled with Roving Indians. No supposition of the dispersion of the aborigines from a centre within the tropics is necessary. Whilst agricultural nations would be certain to carry cultivation wherever they migrated, the tendency of its practice was, to localize a people and arrest changes of dwelling, except within short distances. Agriculture was quite as likely to be propagated backward on the line of migration as forward.

The Village Indians of the lower Colorado, who speak the Pima and Yuma stock languages, are cultivators of the ground, but not house-builders either in adobe brick or stone. They still use the round-roofed wigwam, constructed of rude materials, but large enough for several families. From this fact it may be inferred, notwithstanding the evidence of their long-continued village habits, that their transformation from a non-agricultural to an agricultural life occurred within their present areas, and more recently than that of the other Village Indians of New Mexico. For their ancestors, it is not necessary to look beyond the Northern Roving Indians. It is not improbable that the more advanced class of Village Indians were equally slow in attaining their knowledge of architecture, and that centuries elapsed, after they became agricultural, before they learned or invented the art of constructing houses

with adobe brick and stone. The evidence is decisive, of a very great antiquity of Village Indian life in New Mexico; but the probability is strong that the ancestors of all these nations were immigrants from the valley of the Columbia.

2. *The Village Indians of Mexico and Central America.* — In both of these areas the evidence of occupation from a very ancient date is equally decisive from architectural remains and from the number of stock languages. It is not probable that the number of these languages could be reduced below eight or ten, if the materials for comparison were ample. There are supposed to be eighteen. "We can safely affirm," says Clavigero, "that there are no living or dead languages which can differ more among each other than the languages of the Mexicans, Otomies, Tarascas, Mayas, and Miztecas, — five languages prevailing in different provinces of Mexico." * Such a result might have been expected from the number of inhabited localities and of independent nations. Moreover, the higher development of architecture and of stone sculptures in Chiapa and Yucatan affords evidence of a long period of village life in these areas, — much longer than that of the Aztecs in the valley of Mexico, if we may judge from a comparison of corresponding works. It does not follow, however, that the whole of their experience in village life was acquired within the areas in which they were found.

It is a singular as well as instructive fact that the principal historical nations of Mexico found in possession of the country at the time of the Spanish invasion had resided there but a few hundred years. Their respective migrations were so recent in point of time, that the knowledge of the event, and of the direction from which they came, had not fallen out of remembrance. The particulars, with some degree of minuteness, were preserved by tradition. It becomes then a question of importance how far historical credit can be given to traditions, which are necessarily verbal, and liable to alteration in

* History of Mexico, III. 100. He names (Ibid., page 371) the following languages, fourteen in number, of which a grammar, a dictionary, or both had been prepared: viz. Mexican, Otomie, Tarascan, Zapotecan, Miztecan, Maya, Totonacan, Popolucan, Matlazincan, Huaxtecan, Mixe, Cakciquel, Taraumaran, and Tepehuanan.

their transmission. The question is one worthy of a brief discussion.

Indian nations usually have a definite tradition of their last migration, particularly when it resulted in a prosperous establishment in a new home. It would require several centuries to efface all remembrance of such an experience among a people of ordinary intelligence. An oral tradition of a great migration, embodying an event so influential upon the subsequent life of a nation, would preserve the principal facts with great tenacity. In the absence of improbable circumstances, its essential statements must be accepted as historical evidence. These Indian traditions usually contain internal evidence of probability; and when they speak of no extravagant periods of time or unreasonable occurrences, their credibility may be admitted, on the ground of the extreme improbability that the remembrance of such events should have been lost. These suggestions apply to the historical traditions of the principal Mexican nations, to be stated hereafter, which have an important bearing upon the general conclusions to which the main discussion in this article tends. Whatever support the written or pictorial records of the Aztecs may add is left out of view. After the lapse of a few centuries, it is not uncommon for a claim to autochthony to spring up, and dispute possession with the tradition of a previous migration from a distant land. Thus the Iroquois have a well-defined tradition that they came from the north bank of the St. Lawrence near Montreal into Central New York, by way of the Oswego River, coasting the lake in canoes; and this tradition is confirmed by sufficient independent evidence. They also have a tradition that they sprang out of the ground, the Onondagas near Oswego, and the Senecas near Canandaigua. The traditions of the principal Mexican nations concerning their migration from the North are more specific than that of the Iroquois. They contain such internal evidence of probability that it is difficult to perceive upon what just ground of criticism their authority can be denied.

The Aztecs had a full and circumstantial tradition, not only of their own migration from the North, but also of the migration of several other kindred nations. It is given by Acosta,

whose work was first published at Seville in 1589.* He visited Mexico prior to that date,† and consequently was in the country early enough to reach original sources of information. Substantially the same tradition is given by Herrera and Clavigero. Acosta remarks: "These second peoples, Navatalcas [the first inhabitants he calls Chichemecas], came from other far countries which lie towards the north, where now they have discovered a kingdom which they call New Mexico. There are two provinces in this country,—the one called Aztlan, which is to say, a place of herons; the other Teaculhuacan, which signifies a land of such whose grandfathers were divine. . . . . The Navatalcas paint their beginning and first territory in the figure of a cave, and say they came forth of seven caves to come and people the land of Mexico." He fixes the time of the migration of the first of the seven nations at 720 A. D., — which of course must be considered as an approximate date only, — and the length of time consumed in the movement at eighty years. In like manner the migration of the Aztecs, the last of the seven nations, was commenced in 1022 A. D., according to the same authority. Acosta states the names of these nations and the order of their arrival in Mexico as follows: 1. Suchimilcos, "Nation of the Seeds of Flowers." They settled upon Lake Xochimilco. 2. Chalcas, "People of Mouths." They came long after the former, and settled near them. 3. Tepanecans, "People of the Bridge." They settled on the west side of the lake of Mexico. Their chief town, Azcapuzalco, signifies the "Ants' Nest." They were numerous. 4. Culhuas, "A Crooked People." These were the Tezcucans, who came some time after, and settled upon the east side of the lake. 5. Tlatluicans, "Men of the Sierra, or Mountain." This nation, finding the country around Lake Tezcuco occupied, passed southward, to the other side of the mountain. 6. Tlascaltecans, "Men of Bread." They settled Tlascala. 7. Aztecs, or Mexicans. "Three hundred and two years afterwards [1022] those of the seventh cave or line arrived, which is the Mexican nation; the which, like unto the rest, left

* Natural and Moral History of the East and West Indies, (Lond. ed. 1604,) Grimstone's Trans., pp. 497–504.

† Acosta states in his work (p. 502) that he was in Mexico in 1585.

Aztlan and Teaculhuacan a polite, cultivated, and warlike nation."

Clavigero gives substantially the same tradition. "But of all the nations," he remarks, "which peopled the region of Anahuac, the most renowned and the most signalized in the history of Mexico were those vulgarly called Nahuatlacas. This name . . . . . was principally given to those seven nations, or rather those seven tribes of the same nation, who arrived in that country after the Chichemecas, and peopled the little islands, banks, and boundaries of the Mexican lakes. These tribes were the Sochimilcas, the Chalchesc, the Tepanecas, the Colhuas, the Tlahuicas, the Tlascalans, and the Mexicans. The origin of all these tribes was the province of Aztlan, from whence came the Mexicans, or from some other contiguous to it, and peopled with the same nation. All historians represent them as originally of one and the same country; all of them spoke the same language." * Elsewhere he observes: "The Chichemecas, like the Toltecs, who preceded them, and other nations, which came after them, were originally from the North countries, as we may call the north of America, like the north of Europe, the seminary of the human race." †

Besides this general tradition, there is another of the Aztec migration exclusively, giving a circumstantial account of the motive in which it originated, the various localities in which the emigrants were established for a time on the way, and the incidents connected with their arrival in the valley, and with the foundation of the pueblo of Mexico. They left Aztlan, according to Clavigero, in 1160, arrived at Tulla, north of the

---

* Hist. of Mexico, (Phila. ed. 1817,) Cullen's Trans., I. 141. Herrera adopts this tradition, and remarks upon their Northern origin as follows: "They came from remote parts northward, where New Mexico was afterwards found." (History of America, Lond. ed. 1725, Stevens's Trans., III. 188, 189.)

† Ibid, II. 119. Prescott (Hist. Conq. of Mexico, III. 397) thus refers to the several traditions: "They are admitted to agree in representing the populous North as the prolific hive of the American races. . . . . From this quarter the Toltecs, the Chichemecs, and the kindred races of the Nahuatlacs came successively up the great plateau of the Andes, spreading over the hills and valleys down to the Gulf of Mexico." Again (Ibid., I. 15): "The Mexicans, with whom our history is principally concerned, came also, as has been seen, from the remote regions of the North, the populous hive of nations in the New World, as it has been in the Old.

at Chapultepec in 1245, at Acoloco in 1262, were enslaved by the Cholulans in 1314, freed themselves in 1325, and that year founded Mexico.*

The first and general tradition was evidently derived immediately from original sources. Omitting the attempt at a fixed chronology, which is necessarily conjectural even in regard to the century, and also the previous cave-life, which may embody a more ancient tradition, we may accept as credible the principal fact of a migration of these nations from the North, in the order stated, and within a period not remote. It is probable that this tradition, which may possibly have been derived from Aztec records, rests upon the authority of Acosta alone, in which case its repetition by other authors does not increase its weight. Whether Acosta obtained it directly from aboriginal sources or at second-hand, it is probable in itself, and both in style and matter bears genuine marks of the Indian mind. The names given to these several nations are in strict accordance with the Indian method of national designation, and find their analogues in the names of Northern Indian nations at the present time.† It is also intrinsically probable that these nations migrated at intervals of time, one following the other, and that years were consumed while these several movements were progressing. Since they must have passed through regions partially inhabited, and were striving to enter a highly desirable area already occupied by other nations, their migrations were necessarily military migrations, in which they contended with hostile nations for the mastery of each area. A successful migration, followed by a prosperous establishment in a desirable home, would involve years of effort and several changes of location. The special and more elaborate tradition of the Aztec migration which rests upon the authority of Clavigero corroborates the first. It is not necessary to adopt the minute circumstances or the chronology. The Aztecs, before their arrival in Mexico, could scarcely have possessed an accurate method of recording time; but the principal events which occurred between the time

* History of Mexico, I. 150.

† Thus, Senecas, *Nun-da-wä'-o-no*, "Great Hill People"; Onondagas, *O-nun-'dä-ga-o-no*, "People on the Hills"; Iowas, *Pä-ho'-che*, "Dusty Noses"; Missouris, *Ne-oo'-cha-tä*, "At the Mouth of the Stream"; *Mi-ni-kan-ye*, "Those who plant by the water"; and *O-ga-lal'-lä*, "Raising Camp," — the last two being Dakota nations.

when they are supposed to have left Aztlan (A. D. 1160) and the Spanish conquest (1520), embracing a period of three hundred and sixty years, would be kept in remembrance. Within this period also the lapse of time between particular events would be known with reasonable nearness. It is another confirmatory fact that no extravagant antiquity is claimed for the foundation of the pueblo of Mexico. The Aztec records fixed the period at about 1325, but one hundred and ninety-six years prior to the Spanish conquest. To have increased their numbers and their influence from a small and feeble band, such as they doubtless were when they founded Mexico, to their prosperous condition at the latter date, must have required all the time assigned. It would seem also to create the further necessity of moderating materially the current estimates of their advancement and numbers. These several traditions could scarcely have been fictions of Spanish writers. They are so intrinsically probable in their main recitals, that they may fairly claim to be regarded as historical evidence.*

---

* The Honorable John R. Bartlett, whose conclusions as an investigator are entitled to great respect, questions these traditions as evidence that the Aztecs were immigrants from the North. He observes: "I am unable to learn from what source the prevailing idea has arisen, of the migration of the Aztecs, or ancient Mexicans, from the North into the valley of Mexico, and the three halts they made in their journey thither. This is another idea which has been so widely promulgated that it has settled down into an acknowledged fact, although I confess I have seen no satisfactory evidence of its truth. . . . . The traditions which gave rise to this notion are extremely vague, and were not seriously entertained until Torquemada, Boturini, and Clavigero gave them currency; but they must now give way to the more reliable results from linguistic comparisons. No analogy has yet been traced between the language of the old Mexicans and that of any tribe at the North in the district from which they are supposed to have come; nor in any of the relics, ornaments, or works of art do we observe a resemblance between them." (Personal Narrative, II. 283.)

That a particular Indian language has passed beyond identification with any other in its vocables, and become an independent stock language, is not decisive evidence against a migration of the people speaking it from any place in which we have reason to suppose it once dwelt. It may be mentioned, however, that some words have been detected in the Koluschian of Sitka, and in some other far Northern language, which are believed to be identical with the corresponding words in the Aztec speech. Latham (Notes to Prichard's Eastern Origin of the Celtic Nations, p. 21) refers to this fact in the following language: "The Aztec or Mexican words found in this language were indicated in the Mithridates. Since the publication, however, of that work, they have been shown to exist in other American languages, — some inland, some Southern, some interjacent to the Kolosh and Mexican areas, e. g. in California and elsewhere."

But little is known of the migrations of the Village Indians of Yucatan and Central America, and this little rests upon tradition. The Chiapanese had a similar tradition of a Northern origin. "They say," observes Clavigero, "that the first peoples came from the quarter of the North, and when they arrived at Soconusco they separated, some going to inhabit the country of Nicaragua, and others remaining in Chiapan." It has elsewhere been stated that Oviedo, in 1526, found a people in Nicaragua who spoke an Aztec dialect which would refer them also to an original home in the North.

With these traditions of a Northern origin, which seem to have been current in several nations in Mexico and Central America, and with what is still a matter of obvious inference from the geographical features of North America, and the relation of the valley of the Columbia to all its other areas, it is difficult to arrive at any other conclusion than that the ancestors of all these nations were emigrants from that remarkable valley.

3. *The Mound-Builders.* — The inquiry, thus far, has been restricted to the Indian nations in actual possession of the country at the period of European discovery. It is not to be supposed, however, that the nations found in particular areas were the first occupants. In very many cases the contrary is known to be true. Under the inexorable law which perpetually worked the subdivision of the Indian tribes as they spread abroad, there was a constant tendency towards an obliteration of many of these fragmentary nations, through collisions with one another. Large numbers of these nations, both in North and South America, undoubtedly perished in the course of centuries, not necessarily by the process of extermination, but rather from inability to maintain successfully the struggle for independence. They disappeared under the blow of some calamity, their fragments becoming incorporated with other nations. The several stocks belonging to the Ganowanian family, who were found in possession of the land, are to be regarded as the descendants and representatives of an original stock, which flowed out in successive streams from some original centre. The remoteness in the past of their first establishment must be estimated by the time required to cre-

ate the present diversity of speech, both in dialects and stock languages.

Among those nations who are without recognized descendants are the Mound-Builders who lived east of the Mississippi. It is evident that they were agricultural and Village Indians, from their artificial embankments, their implements and utensils, and from their selection of the areas most poorly provided with fish and game. From the absence of all traditionary knowledge of their existence, amongst the nations found in possession of their territories, it is also to be inferred that the period of their occupation was ancient. Their disappearance was probably gradual, and completed before the advent of the present stocks, or simultaneously with their arrival. The small number of sites of ancient villages, and the scanty population assignable to Indian villages even of the largest class, particularly in cold climates, are good reasons for supposing they were never very numerous. It is a reasonable conjecture, as elsewhere stated, that they were Village Indians from New Mexico. In fact, there is no other region from which they could have been derived; unless it be assumed that, originally Roving Indians, they had become, after their establishment east of the Mississippi, Village Indians of the highest type, — of which there is not the slightest probability. It seems more likely that their retirement from the country was voluntary, than that they were expelled by an influx of roving nations. If their overthrow had been the result of a protracted warfare, all remembrance of so remarkable an event would scarcely have been lost among the nations by whom they were displaced. A warm climate was to some extent necessary for the successful maintenance of the highest form of Village Indian life. In the struggle for existence in the colder climates, Indian arts and ingenuity have been taxed quite as severely to provide clothing as food. It is, therefore, not improbable that the attempt to transfer the type of village life of New Mexico to the Ohio valley proved a failure; and that after great efforts, continued for more centuries than one, it was finally abandoned, and they gradually withdrew, first into the Gulf States, and lastly from the country altogether.

No reference has been made to the Eskimo, for the reason

that their system of consanguinity and affinity disconnects them from the Ganowanian family. The Eskimo were originally emigrants from Asia, if the fact that a portion of this stock still exists upon the Asiatic side of the Strait of Behring can be considered sufficient evidence. On the assumption that the Ganowanian family came out of Asia, their migration was necessarily very much earlier than than that of the Eskimo. This is sufficiently demonstrated by the number of stock languages and dialects now existing in the former family, which, on the supposition of an Asiatic origin, would have required for their formation immensely long periods of time after their arrival on this continent. On the contrary, the dialects of the Eskimo, from the Gulf of Anadyr in Asia, through Arctic America and Greenland, still belong to the same stock language, which precludes the supposition of any great antiquity of the Eskimo on the American continent.

This concludes the suggestions the writer intended to make with respect to particular migrations. The discussion has been made sufficiently comprehensive to include the body of the American aborigines found in possession at the period of European discovery. If the views herein presented as to these stocks are sound, those which have disappeared, and those which remain unnoticed, must have followed the same routes. Some general considerations will conclude these articles.

With respect to the influence of agricultural subsistence in tending to create separate centres of population, either in South or North America, able collectively to offset the superior advantages in point of natural means of subsistence possessed by the valley of the Columbia, some further discussion may be necessary, lest a doubt should remain upon this material question. An outgrowth of civilization in a particular area, founded upon a subsistence obtained by agriculture, might, if carried far enough, have neutralized the previously superior advantages of the valley of the Columbia, and thus have created a more fruitful centre of population, able to send forth larger streams to overpower those issuing from that area. But there is not a fact to show that the Village Indians of Central America or Mexico ever spread northward, or competed with the Northern Indians for the possession of any part of the continent north

of the immediate valley of Mexico; while several reasons may be assigned against the supposition of a movement in that direction. In the first place, the principal historical nations found in Mexico were themselves emigrants from the North. Secondly, climatic considerations, in the absence of overcrowded territories, would tend to repress migrations from a warm to a colder region. Thirdly, their type of village life was not adapted to cold climates. Although possessed of cotton, and the art of spinning and weaving it into light fabrics, this was incapable of affording them a warm apparel. The Village Indians of New Mexico, although well advanced in Indian arts, wore buffalo-robes and other robes of skins, like the Roving Indians. Friar Marcos de Niza, in his relation, speaking of the Cibolans in 1540, remarks: "Their apparel is of cotton and ox-hides, and this is their most commendable and honorable apparel."* They possessed no manufactured fabric capable of becoming a substitute for skins in the winter season. Fourthly, their institutions were unfavorable to the formation of a state capable of embracing and governing the descendants of an original stock as it increased in numbers and spread over larger areas. It was impossible to comprehend great numbers of the same lineage and language under one Indian government, and thus create a large homogeneous population; and it is extremely doubtful whether there ever were at one time, in any part of North America, one hundred thousand Indians who spoke the same dialect. This, if true, is so remarkable as well as important a fact, that the disproval of it would be a valuable contribution to the history of the American aborigines. These were organized into small bands or nations, the people of which spoke the same dialect. In many instances two or more such nations speaking dialects of the same stock language were united into a confederacy. The government of each was an oligarchy of chiefs in council, and the system failed to arrest the tendency to repeated subdivision, followed by territorial separation, independence, and the gradual formation of new dialects. As a necessary consequence of this multiplicity of nations and dialects, without any comprehensive governmental organization, per-

* Hakluyt's Collection of Voyages, London, England, 1600, III. 372.

petual warfare was superadded to the other hardships of their condition, which tended to prevent their increase. The Aztec confederacy was the highest and most successful effort of the North American Indian nations to establish an Indian power. Yet it created neither an empire nor a state, in any proper sense of those terms. It subdued and placed under tribute a number of feeble petty nations, chiefly south of the valley; but it failed to consolidate them into one people, even for governmental purposes. On the contrary, it is plain that the confederacy was unable to wield the power of these tributary nations for common national objects.* A government founded upon territory, resting upon the body of the people, and administered by law, is the growth of ages. The American aborigines were thousands of years behind the modern idea of a state in their development. The table-lands of Mexico have no history prior to the Aztec occupation, except the dim account of their Toltec predecessors, and the unimportant history of their contemporaries. No people were ever able to hold these table-lands and valleys long enough to found a state; to rise by force of numbers out of the tribal, national and confederate organizations into a true political life, with a government of fixed and equal laws in the place of the arbitrary will of chiefs and the equally fluctuating determinations of councils. The time had not arrived, in the successive stages of progressive experience, for the American Indian to arrive at the forms of civilization. Fifthly, agriculture transformed them from Roving into Village Indians, which tended to localize them, as has been elsewhere stated; but this, although the numbers speaking the same dialect were thereby considerably increased, restricted them to much smaller areas than those occupied by nations of Roving Indians. Lastly, the productiveness of their agriculture was very limited, from the small extent of land cultivated, imperfect implements, and the amount of labor involved.

It does not appear, therefore, that there was any centre of population, either in Mexico or elsewhere, which became, on the basis of agricultural subsistence, a competitor with the

* But one of these nations responded to the call for aid against the Spaniards; and this tardy force was dispersed before it reached the scene of action.

fish-producing country of the Columbia in populating the continent. On the contrary, we are compelled to look to the last-named region for that constant surplus of numbers, which would furnish successive streams of emigrants, through indefinite periods of time, until an equilibrium of population was reached throughout the continent. Since physical causes were superior to human arts and institutions in influencing the movements of the aborigines, these causes remained unaffected, except to a limited extent, by the indigenous civilization which sprang up in particular areas. It is surprising how small an excess of natural advantages will invest a single district of country with permanent control over an entire continent in the primitive periods of man's existence; and with how great difficulty that superiority is neutralized and overcome. The reason is found in the uniformity of the operation of physical causes. We have seen that the Shoshonee migration was in progress at the time of European colonization; and that, at the last moment of the exclusive possession of North America by its aboriginal inhabitants, the valley of the Columbia was sending out another stock language and an independent people, to take their place in the midst of the languages and nations that had preceded them from the same land. Likewise the ultimate fact is reached, that a fish subsistence created the surplus of numbers which first spread abroad from this initial point to people North America, and from time to time supplied the successive bands of emigrants which replenished the continent with inhabitants.

It remains to apply the facts and conclusions, thus reached in relation to the North American Indians, to the aborigines of South America, for the purpose of ascertaining whether they are sufficient to sustain a similar hypothesis with regard to the peopling of the southern from the northern continent.

We are now prepared to recognize the existence of a constant tendency of the aboriginal population to flow southward from the valley of the Columbia, down the mountain-chains toward the Isthmus of Panama. A movement northward would be less probable, from climatic reasons, and eastward still less, from the barrier of the central plains. Mexico and Central America presumptively were first reached and occu-

pied. Each successive stream of population would press upon its predecessors, tending to force the first emigrants southward through the Isthmus into South America, where the Andes, a continuation substantially of the Rocky Mountain chain, would direct the movement toward Patagonia. It is also probable, as has been elsewhere suggested, that both divisions of the continent were overspread with Roving Indians before the discovery of corn and the art of cultivating it. Neither can it be supposed that the remote ancestors of the American aborigines were as far advanced in the arts of life as the Roving Indians were when first discovered; for there are many stages of progress in the ages of barbarism, as well as in the age of civilization. Whatever may be the experience of particular nations or stocks, the human family forever progresses. Century after century might have elapsed before the thought of utilizing corn and the bean dawned upon the Indian mind. The art of cultivating the earth, upon the limited scale on which they practised it, created a new epoch in the Indian family. It not only favored, but necessitated village life, imperfectly attained before, which in turn tended to a rapid development of Indian arts. The condition and antecedents of the Mexican and Central-American nations, at the period of the Spanish conquest, render it probable that the struggle between the Roving and Village Indians for the possession of these regions had been continuous from age to age, the former expelling the latter and becoming themselves Village Indians, to be afterwards forced southward by succeeding immigrants. The attractive character of the table-lands and valleys of Mexico, and their position on the narrowing highway to the gate of Panama, made it extremely difficult to hold these lands against advancing bands, except by superior numbers, or a higher knowledge of the art of war. In the latter respect it is well known that the Village Indians had made no advance beyond the Roving Indians, except in the art of constructing great communal edifices of the nature of fortresses, which the Aztecs had carried a step farther by surrounding their pueblo with water defences. The bow and arrow and the war-club were the principal weapons of all alike, and the most destructive of which they had any knowledge.

The first people in the valley of Mexico, of whom any knowledge has been preserved, were the Toltecs. They are supposed to have made considerable progress in civilization; but this did not enable them to hold the valley any more successfully than their predecessors, whoever they may have been. They evidently yielded to the influence of some calamity, and silently departed, none knew whither. After the discovery by Oviedo, in 1526, of a people in Nicaragua who spoke a dialect of the Aztec language, this was supposed to be the remains of that nation;* and whether it was so or not, the finding of an Aztec stock in this extreme southern position seems to confirm the general conclusion, that the drift of population, particularly of fragments of nations, was southward. The facts collectively seem to sustain the inference that nation after nation, through century after century, had tried the experiment of holding these table-lands and valleys against the Roving Indians constantly flowing down upon them, and that, one after the other, they had been borne on toward the South, and many of them, doubtless, swept through the Isthmus into South America. Last, the Aztecs and their confederates tried the experiment, with the probable additional advantage of reaching the valley as agricultural and Village Indians. Sufficient time, however, had not elapsed to demonstrate their ability to hold an area lying across the natural highway of the continent southward. It should be observed that, within the short period of two hundred years before the Spanish Conquest, the Aztec confederacy had risen from very small beginnings.† At the time of the Spanish invasion they were still confronted upon the east, north, and west by independent and hostile nations, whose power they had not been able to break. It may be a question

* Trans. Am. Ethn. Soc., I. 8.

† Immediately prior to the founding of the pueblo of Mexico (1325) they were living at Acoloco, which consisted, says Clavigero, "of a number of small islands in the southern extremity of the lake. . . . . There, for the space of fifty-two years, they led the most miserable life; they subsisted on fish and all sorts of insects, and the roots of the marshes, and covered themselves with the leaves of the amoxtli, which grows plentifully in that lake. . . . . Their habitations were wretched huts, made of the reeds and rushes which the lake produced. It would be totally incredible that for so many years they were able to keep in existence in

whether the confederacy would have been able to maintain its position permanently, if it had been left to the natural course of events, free from European interference. Its position, surrounded by water defences substantially impregnable to Indian warfare, was the strongest guaranty of successful resistance, and the accumulation of independent bands on its northern frontier was the source of its greatest danger. With the possession of this fertile valley, and with the advantages of climate and of agricultural productions, it might have been expected that some native stock would have been able to develop a nation within this area, sufficiently numerous and powerful to influence materially the peopling of both divisions of the continent. But the Aztecs would probably have failed of such a destiny, as all previous confederacies, if such existed, had failed, and for reasons inherent in their institutions.

It cannot have escaped attention that the general course of Indian migrations upon the North American continent, under the influence of physical causes, would tend to an early peopling of South America. If the general views which have been now presented with reference to the initial point and general direction of these migrations are considered established, they are sufficient to create a strong presumption that South America received its first inhabitants from the north ; and this presumption would require strong evidence to rebut it. Whether the discovery of corn and the introduction of agriculture occurred north or south of the Isthmus of Panama, it is at least plain that it spread at a remote period over Central America and Mexico ; and from that time forward the effect of the general course of Indian migrations was to expel agricultural and Village Indians from North into South America. This process,

---

a place so disadvantageous, where they were so stinted in the necessaries of life, were it not verified by their historians and by succeeding events." (Hist. Conq. Mexico, I. 156.)

The Aztecs were the first occupiers of the site of Mexico. But other nations of the same descent, who entered the valley before them, were in possession of the margins of the lakes, and would hardly have overlooked the great natural strength of this site, had it then been surrounded by Lake Tezcuco. Their neglect of it confirms the suggestion, elsewhere made, that the pueblo of Mexico was surrounded by artificial ponds made by the Aztecs.

long continued, would tend to give to South America a superior class of inhabitants, and, possibly, an older and higher civilization. The northern continent, in which barbarous nations preponderated, was thus impoverished to some extent by losing a portion of its most advanced and cultivated inhabitants for the benefit of the southern. The geographical features of America, and the relative distribution of the natural means of subsistence, are such as to render it extremely probable that a primitive family planted in the valley of the Columbia, and migrating from this area under the exclusive influence of physical causes, would have reached Patagonia, as I have elsewhere suggested, sooner than they would Florida. It may therefore be claimed, with a strong degree of probability, that the ancestors of the South American Indians originated in this valley.

In this and a preceding article, an attempt has been made to embody the principal facts bearing upon the migrations of the North American Indians, in order to form an hypothesis for explaining the initial point of those migrations and their general courses. It was found that these migrations were controlled almost exclusively by physical causes; and that their natural highways were indicated by the direction of the mountain-chains, and the courses of the great rivers; while a free communication between the western and eastern sides of North America was interrupted by the formidable barrier of the central prairie area. In the second place, a comparison of the several districts of North America, with reference to the natural means of subsistence afforded by them, revealed great differences, and showed that the valley of the Columbia surpassed all other regions of America in the abundance and variety of food it furnished, to which was added the advantage of a mild and genial climate. There, and there alone, was found a region capable of furnishing a surplus population developed from the stable, unvarying supply of *fish subsistence*, and thrown off at such intervals of time as would explain the relations of the several stocks to each other, and to the land of their common origin. In the third place, certain facts were presented tending to show that Indian agriculture was never carried far enough to counterbalance the advantages of the

abundant fish subsistence of the Columbia River. It was further shown that the Village Indians were unable to develop, upon agricultural subsistence, numbers sufficient to overflow the areas of the Roving nations and accomplish their displacement; and that, on the contrary, the latter nations from time to time penetrated the agricultural districts and became themselves Village Indians, thus contributing to their numbers; and finally, that the Roving and partially Village Indians seem, from first to last, to have taken the leading part in peopling the areas of North America. The migrations of particular stocks were then considered, and the relations of the subdivisions of each were indicated. Comparisons were also made of the relative amounts of subsistence afforded by nature in different parts of the continent, in order to find the secondary centres from which population spread. After these had been pointed out, we next endeavored, through the general relations of these stocks to each other, and from their languages, traditions, and known migrations, to find the initial point where these several streams took their rise. These investigations and comparisons seemed to establish, with a reasonable degree of certainty, the following conclusions: First, that the distribution of the aborigines over North America began on the Pacific side of the continent; second, that the several stock languages east of the Rocky Mountains and north of New Mexico had become distinct before these stocks migrated eastward; third, that the nations of Mexico and Central America were emigrants from the North; and last, that the initial point of all these migrations was in the valley of the Columbia. In this valley a land is discovered so amply endowed by nature with the means of subsistence, and standing in such geographical relations to the remainder of North America, as to explain and harmonize the phenomena under consideration. All the conditions of an adequate and satisfactory hypothesis for the explanation of the migrations of the American Indians seem to have been fulfilled. Since subsistence on the bounties of nature necessarily precedes agriculture in the order of time, any hypothesis looking to any other nursery of population will fail for the want of the indispensable condition of a superabundant supply, by nature, of the

means of subsistence. It is entirely immaterial at what place on the shores of the Pacific, between the Arctic Sea and Mexico, the Indian family made its first appearance. If, in fact, it came from beyond the sea, it would gravitate irresistibly to the valley of the Columbia. That valley and the adjacent sea-coasts contained the paradise of the red man in the age of stone, when fish was his main sustenance, and game and bread-roots accessories for the promotion of his physical development. It will be impossible to explain the peopling of North America from any other centre. Had the Indian family been first planted in South America, and their descendants in course of time reached this valley, it would, from and after that event, have reversed the course of Indian migrations and become the source from which both divisions of the continent would have received inhabitants. No other area in either could compete with it in advantages for the support and increase of population. Ample time must have elapsed since the first occupation of this valley to efface beyond recovery all traces of a migration from South America, if such ever occurred.

With respect to the anterior question, whether the Indian family reached North or South America first, on the assumption that it had an Asiatic origin, we are left to a choice of probabilities. It is plain, however, that physical considerations and the types of man in Northeastern Asia point to this section of Asia as the source, and to the Aleutian Islands as the probable avenue, of this antecedent migration. This is no new hypothesis. A belief in his Asiatic origin was one of the first conclusions which followed the discovery of the Indian and a knowledge of his physical characteristics. Subsequent investigations have strengthened the grounds upon which this belief was based.

It will furnish a not inappropriate conclusion to these articles to restate briefly the facts and reasons which support the inference of a derivation of the Indian family from Northeastern Asia.

In the first place the number of distinct types of mankind in Asia, contrasted with the single type, aside from the Eskimo, existing in America, shows conclusively that the Asiatic continent has been occupied by man much the longer of the two.

The striking affinities in physical characteristics between the Mongolian and Tungusian stocks of Asia and the Indian stocks of America, and the near approach of other Asiatic stocks to both, seem to compel us to assume an Asiatic origin for the American Indian, unless the independent creation of man in America be assumed. Secondly, there are two existing avenues between the two continents; one of which, across the Straits of Behring, has been actually proved to be practicable, by the Eskimo migration; and the other, by the Aleutian Islands, is rendered a probable route by the fact that most of these islands are now inhabited by a people of common descent, who have spread from island to island. Whether the Eskimo had been forced northward in Asia by the pressure of circumstances is immaterial, since it was necessary that they should be hyperborean in their habits to render possible their transit across the icy strait, which is about fifty miles wide where it is narrowest.* But it was not necessary that the ancestors of the American aborigines should have become hyperboreans in Asia, to explain their migration to America. The Aleutian Islands furnish a possible as well as much more probable route. It is not to be supposed that it was a deliberate migration in numbers which brought the Ganowanian family to America, if they came from Asia. The natural obstacles presented to a transit by the Aleutian Islands lead to the inference that the migration must have been purely accidental, and limited, it is not unlikely, to a canoe-load of men and women. It may have been repeated at several different times in different ages, under similar circumstances, but limited in each case to inconsiderable numbers. If such accidental emigrants chanced to be of different stocks, the later ones would make but a slight impression upon the first stock that reached America. These islands, the summits of a chain of submarine mountains, stretch continuously and substantially in sight of each other from the peninsula of Alaska to the Cape of Kamtchatka, with the following principal interruptions: The Amoukhta pass, separating two groups of these

* Map of Alaska and the Aleutian Islands, U. S. Coast Survey Office, attached to speech of Hon. Charles Sumner in the Senate of the United States on "The Cession of Russian America," 1867.

islands, is about sixty miles across; from the island of Goreloi to the island of Semisopochnoi is the same distance; from the latter to Semitchi Island is about fifty miles; from the island of Attou to Copper Island — which is much the widest interval between any two islands of the chain — is two hundred and thirty miles; and from Behring's Island, the last, and one of the largest, of the series, to Cape Kamtchatka on the Asiatic coast is one hundred miles.* A migration by way of these islands is not improbable, and there are two facts which create a presumption in favor of the occurrence of such a migration by the mere accidents of the sea before the lapse of many ages after Asia was overspread with inhabitants. The first is the ocean stream of the Asiatic coast, — the counterpart of the Gulf Stream of the North Atlantic, — which, rising in the South Pacific and flowing northward, skirts the shores of the Japanese and Kurilian Islands nearly to the Cape of Kamtchatka, where it is deflected to the eastward, and divides into two streams. One of these, following the coast, enters Behring's Strait, but the other, the main stream, crosses the Pacific eastward along the south shores of the Aleutian Islands to Alaska, where it turns down the American coast. It is not entirely lost until it reaches the shores of California. This ocean stream might easily bear off canoe-men, once thrown upon its current, from the Kurilian Islands, and from the coasts of Asia, to the Aleutian Islands. After Attou Island, which is but four hundred and forty miles from the nearest point in Asia, was gained, the problem of reaching Alaska would be substantially solved. It would thus seem that an instrumentality was provided in this ocean stream, whereby the American continent might become accessible from Asia in the early ages of the human family. The second fact is the character and position of the Amoor, one of the great rivers of Asia, which stands in nearly the same relation to the northeastern section of that continent that the Columbia does to the northwestern portion of the American. This river, from its fisheries, although inferior to the Columbia, must have attracted inhabitants to its banks at a very early period in Asiatic history. Its occupation would, in due time, have led to boat

* Map before cited.

navigation, to familiarity with the sea, to the exploration and occupation of the adjacent sea-coasts and islands, and would thus have prepared the way for peopling the Aleutian Islands in the manner stated. It is a striking fact that the Tungusian and Mongolian stocks, the nearest in type, of existing Asiatics, to the American aborigines, still hold the Amoor River, upon which they have lived from time immemorial.

In the third and last place, the systems of consanguinity and affinity of several Asiatic stocks agree with that of the American aborigines. Omitting all discussion of the results of a comparison of systems, it may be stated that the system of the Seneca-Iroquois Indians of New York is identical, not only in radical characteristics, but also in the greater portion of its minute details, with that of the Tamil people of South India.* This identity in complicated and elaborate systems is hardly accidental. There are but four hypotheses conceivable for its explanation, — first, by borrowing one from the other; second, by accidental invention by different peoples in disconnected areas (the system being treated as arbitrary and artificial); third, by spontaneous growth or development, in similar conditions of society (the system being treated as natural); and fourth, by inheritance with the blood from a common original source. The first assumes territorial connection, and the consequent Asiatic origin of the Ganowanian family. The second is an impossible hypothesis. As the system embodies upwards of twenty arbitrary particulars, the improbability of their accidental concurrence in the Seneca-Iroquois and the Tamil, increasing with the addition of each particular from first to last, becomes finally an impossibility. The third hypothesis is substantial, and deserves consideration. It assumes that the system is natural in its origin, and in accordance with the nature of descents. It must therefore further assume that the ancestors of the Seneca-Iroquois, and of the Tamilian people of India, if created in independent zoölogical provinces, have not only passed through the same experiences, but also have developed through great reformatory movements the same sequence of customs and institutions,

* For a comparison of the Tamil and Seneca-Iroquois systems, see Proceedings of American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Vol. VII, p. 456.

and have wrought out by organic growth the Ganowanian system in America and the Turanian system in Asia; the two remaining identical after having been severally transmitted with the blood through centuries of time. In view of these difficulties, it will probably be found, in the sequel, that the fourth hypothesis, that of transmission with the blood from common ancestors, is the most satisfactory.

LEWIS H. MORGAN.

ART. III. — *Tree and Serpent Worship; or, Illustrations of Mythology and Art in India, in the First and Fourth Centuries after Christ. From the Sculptures of the Buddhist Topes at Sanchi and Amravati. Prepared under the Authority of the Secretary of State for India in Council.* By JAMES FERGUSSON, Author of Picturesque Illustrations of Indian Architecture; History of Architecture. London: India Museum. 1868.

THE story of this remarkable book is a strange one. In 1845, Mr. — now Sir Walter — Elliott, at that time Commissioner in Guntûr, had excavated a considerable portion of the Buddhist tope at Amravati, on the Kistna, and sent down to Madras the results of his explorations. They lay there, exposed to the wind and the rain, for ten or twelve years, and then were sent to England, where, after a short sojourn in the docks, they were practically as good as lost to the scientific world. Years passed by, and their very existence on British soil was entirely forgotten. In the coach-house of Fife House they were huddled up in a heap, and looked upon, by the servants in whose charge they were, as so much rubbish.

By a mere chance, Mr. Fergusson, the eminent historian of architecture, came across and saved these valuable relics of an ancient civilization, and by an attentive study of them discovered the traces of an ancient creed, which he now thinks was once spread all over the world. This creed is tree and serpent worship. To the elucidation of this subject the first part

of Mr. Fergusson's book is exclusively devoted. The remainder contains a description of the temples of Sanchi and Amravati from an architectural point of view, ninety-nine splendidly executed photographic and lithographic representations of the most important sculptures, and some general views. The work, published at the expense of the British government, is one of extraordinary sumptuousness. The general opinions its author enunciates in it will give rise to much debate; the more because Mr. Fergusson has in this publication repeated some favorite and rather eccentric theories of his own, concerning the drift of the "Aryan" and the "Turanian" mind.

For the guidance of readers unfamiliar with his views, I may remark here that Mr. Fergusson is pre-eminently enthusiastic about the Aryan race, to which the Hindoos of Northern India belong, and from which all European nations have sprung, with the exception of the Finno-Tartar tribes of Russia, the Finns and Lapps of Sweden and Norway, the Magyars of Hungary, and the Turks. Yet, while asserting the superiority of the Aryans, Mr. Fergusson sees in the "lower race" of the Turanians the originators of the very art which one might think he, above all men, would consider as an attribute of the "superior" stock, — the art of building! This, as coming from an authority on the subject of architecture, appears extraordinary; but not less startling are his notions about the origin of the fairy tales which are the common property of the Hindoo, Germanic, and, one may say, of all the Aryan races.

He says: —

"No one familiar with the subject, who reads these tales, can fail to be struck with the similarity that exists between them and many of those collected by the brothers Grimm, and others, from German and Scandinavian sources, and also with some of the more ancient Grecian myths. The usual mode of accounting for this identity, which can hardly be accidental, is to assume that the tales were originally invented by Aryan nurses beside the cradles of the race in Balkh and Bokhara, and that they were carried east and west by their alumni, when they set out on their travels, some four or five thousand years ago. The results of my reading have led me to conclusions widely different from this fashionable hypothesis. My belief is, that all the serpents and dragons, all the dwarfs and magicians, of these tales, — all the fairy mythology, in fact, of the East and West, belongs to

the Turanian races. These, as I have frequently had occasion to mention, underlie the Aryan races everywhere in Europe, as in Asia, and occasionally crop up here and there through the upper crust, often when least expected. So far as I understand the idiosyncrasy of the two races, nothing can be more antagonistic to the tastes and feelings of the Aryans than these wild imaginings, while few things, on the contrary, could be more congenial to the comparatively infantile intellect of the Turanian race."

From this view I, for my part, dissent entirely. I believe mankind, even in its most widely separated branches, is related closely enough to be able to elaborate as well as to enjoy in common what Mr. Fergusson calls "these wild imaginings," — in other words, these poetical conceptions of the good and evil forces of nature. At any rate, we know that not only in its childhood, but also in its best manhood, the Aryan stock has a wonderful relish for such "wild imaginings," which does not preclude it from clear reasoning when that is required. Now, where we find so decided a popular inclination towards the fanciful, there seems to be no call to make an alleged Turanian substratum answerable for it. In this, as in some other matters, I believe the distinguished writer of "Tree and Serpent Worship" has gone astray. But his book is replete with suggestive matter; and the way in which he deals with his special subject opens up, at all events, a new vista, albeit we may feel that, in points of detail, he has here and there stretched or curtailed a fact to make it fit into a theory. This I say without intending disparagement of Mr. Fergusson. I know too well how the mind, on finding some new light dawning upon it, may be carried away, and unconsciously led into overdrawn representations and misleading half-suppressions. Time, however, reduces the exaggerated theory to its proper proportions.

Of this there can be no doubt, — that Mr. Fergusson has satisfactorily made out the wide prevalence of tree and serpent worship as an ancient form of creed. The adoration of the snake is of course the more puzzling of the two. On this point the author says: —

"There are few things which at first sight appear to us at the present day so strange, or less easy to account for, than that worship

which was once so generally offered to the serpent-god. If not the oldest, it ranks at least among the earliest forms through which the human intellect sought to propitiate the unknown powers. Traces of its existence are found, not only in every country of the Old World, but before the New was discovered by us the same strange idolatry had long prevailed there, and even now the worship of the serpent is found lurking in out-of-the-way corners of the globe, and startles us at times with the unhallowed rites which seem generally to have been associated with its prevalence. . . . . On the other hand, when it comes to be more closely examined, the worship of the serpent is not so strange as it might at first sight appear. As was well remarked by an ancient author, 'the serpent, alone of all animals without legs or arms, or any of the usual appliances for locomotion, still moves with singular celerity,' and, he might have added, grace. . . . . There is no jerk, no reflex motion, as in all other animals, even fishes, but a continuous progression in the most graceful curves. . . . . Then, too, a serpent can exist for an indefinite time without food or apparent hunger. He periodically casts his skin, and, as the ancients fabled, by that process renewed his youth. Add to this his longevity, which, though not so great as was often supposed, is still sufficient to make the superstitious forget how long an individual may have been reverenced, in order that they may ascribe to him immortality."

In these qualities, together with the deadly powers of some of the serpent tribe, — powers which are so different from those of the remainder of the animal kingdom, — Mr. Fergusson finds the main explanation of the respect, reverence, and awe which a primitive people felt for the snake. Still he cannot but acknowledge that, while fear might seem to suffice to account for the prevalence of the worship, on looking closely at it, we find phenomena of a totally different character. When we first meet serpent-worship, either in the wilderness of Sinai, the groves of Epidaurus, or in Sarmatian huts, the serpent is always the Agathodæmon, the bringer of health and good fortune. His worship may have begun in fear; but long before the stage at which we become acquainted with it, it had, amongst its votaries, passed to the opposite extreme. The solution of this perplexing combination is not a little difficult.

Equally mysterious is the apparent connection between the practice of serpent-worship and human sacrifices. "Wherever human sacrifices prevailed, there serpent-worship is found also,

though the converse does not appear so capable of proof." In Egypt, "human sacrifices never assumed the position of a religious or domestic institution"; but then "serpent-worship in Egypt seems likewise to have been sporadic and of little importance." In Judæa, so long as any traces of serpent-worship prevailed, the idea of human sacrifices seems to have been familiar. After Hezekiah's time we simultaneously lose all traces of both. So long as Greece was Pelasgic, serpent-worship and human sacrifices were combined; but with the return of the Heraclidæ the latter practice died out, though the former still lingered in a modified form. In Mexico and Dahomey, where in more modern times human sacrifices have been practised to an extent not known elsewhere, serpent-worship was and is the typical and most important form of propitiation of supernatural powers; while, in India, there can be little doubt that the two existed together from the earliest time. "Notwithstanding all these coincidences, — and they might easily be extended, — it must not be overlooked that nowhere can we trace any direct connection between the two forms of faith. No human sacrifice was anywhere made to propitiate the serpent, nor was it ever pretended that any human victim was ever devoured by the snake-god. In all instances the serpent is the Agathodæmon, the bringer of health or good fortune, the protector of men or of treasure; and nowhere was it sought to propitiate him by sacrifice of life beyond what was necessary for food, or to appease him by blood-offerings." The question whether there was a real connection between the two, or only an accidental juxtaposition, remains, therefore, to be investigated.

As to tree-worship, although this is "nearly as far removed from our ordinary forms of faith as serpent-worship, still it can hardly be considered as more than an exaggerated perversion of many of the ideas now current. . . . . There is such wondrous beauty in the external form of trees, and so welcome a shelter beneath their overarching boughs, that we should not feel surprise that in early ages groves were considered as the fittest temples for the gods. . . . . With all their poetry and all their usefulness, we can hardly feel astonished that the primitive races of mankind should have considered trees as the choicest gift of the gods to men, and should have believed that

their spirits still delighted to dwell among their branches, or spoke oracles through the rustling of their leaves."

Perhaps the question might be started whether the serpent, when looked at in the attitude of rest, forming as it were a ring, may not have served as a symbol of the earth as well as of eternity, — the ring being without beginning and end. And again it may be asked whether primitive races were not struck by the mystery of growth, which seems most strange in the ever-changing forms of the vegetable kingdom, — forms that gradually unfold before our eyes in a series of wonderful transformations; and whether some sentiment of awe arising from these phenomena may not have been mixed up with tree-worship.

I will not, however, enter into any hypotheses of my own. The subject needs first to be treated from an historical point of view. Mr. Fergusson, who has collected the existing material with most praiseworthy assiduity, says: —

"In the present state of our knowledge we are not in a position to indicate the locality where it [serpent-worship] first may have appeared, or the time when it first became established among mankind. In so far as such glimmerings as we possess enable us to guess the locality of its origin, I would feel inclined to say that it came from the mud of the Lower Euphrates, among a people of *Turanian* origin, and spread thence as from a centre to every country or land of the Old World in which a *Turanian* people settled. *Apparently no Semitic and no people of Aryan race ever adopted it as a form of faith.* It is true we find it in Judæa, but almost certainly it was there an outcrop from the older underlying strata of the population. We find it also in Greece and in Scandinavia, among people whom we know principally as Aryan; but there, too, it is like the tares of a previous crop springing up among the stems of a badly cultivated field of wheat. The essence of serpent-worship is as diametrically opposed to the spirit of the Veda or of the Bible as is possible to conceive two faiths to be; and with varying degrees of dilution the spirit of these two works pervades in a greater or less extent all the forms of the religions of the Aryan and the Semitic races. *On the other hand, any form of animal-worship is perfectly consistent with the lower intellectual status of the Turanian races*; and all history tells us that it is among them, and essentially among them alone, that serpent-worship is really found to prevail."

In these words, some of which I have italicized, is contained

the key-note of the book. Tree-worship the author lets pass as a harmless faith or superstition. Serpent-worship, that uglier creed, which is connected also with the sacrifice of human victims, he charges upon the Turanian races, and tries to establish this origin of it in the case of every nation addicted to the practice. There can be little doubt that he has proved the wide spread of tree and serpent worship in early ages, and that his work, in this respect, is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the strange religious aberrations of the human mind. But when he says that "*all history*" tells us that the Turanians were essentially the serpent-worshippers, it seems to me that he makes a few facts serve to support a foregone conclusion; and that it would have been better, with the insufficient data as yet before us, simply to set forth what we at present know, than to flatter our Aryan souls with the belief that we never were like our inferior brethren of Turan.

In an attempt to investigate any form of ancient mythology from an historical point of view, Mr. Fergusson naturally turns first to Egypt; for "not only was Egypt the earliest-civilized of all the countries of the ancient world, in so far at least as we at present know, but she was pre-eminently the parent of all idolatries."

Egypt not being provably Turanian, this statement may strike the reader as contradictory to what had previously been said by the same author as to the difference between Aryans and Semites on the one hand, and Turanians on the other. Among the Egyptians, with all the knowledge they had, everything was worshipped. "From bulls to beetles, or from crocodiles to cats, it made little difference: all came alike to a people so essentially religious as the Egyptians seem to have been. It is little wonder, therefore, that serpents, and it may be trees, should be included in their multifarious pantheon, and it is easy to detect numerous instances of the honors bestowed on both." In the legends referring to Isis and Osiris, to the goddess Netpe, and to Athor, trees play their part. The sculptures which cover the walls of the temples are also full of tree and serpent illustrations. In classical authors, too, there are many passages which may be quoted in proof of the existence of that kind of worship among

Egyptians. Yet Mr. Fergusson dismisses all this with the remark that it was "only a fractional part of the nature-worship of the Egyptians, and neither the most prominent nor the most important"; forgetting, as it seems to me, that the same "fractional" character may be observed in the tree and serpent worship of other nations, of whom he subsequently speaks.

"In the mud of the Lower Euphrates" Mr. Fergusson believes serpent-worship to have arisen. The proofs of this view are, however, wanting. He himself confesses that, — "unfortunately, long before the Greeks or any foreign travellers visited Babylonia, — the great wave of the dominion of the Semitic Assyrian had passed over it, and nearly obliterated all traces of the earlier Chaldean forms; and as strangers ignorant of the language, it is hardly to be expected that they would have dug up the fossil remains of an extinct religion."

The one chance that now remains to us for recovering it is from the cuneiform inscriptions. In the mean while, Sir Henry Rawlinson states that Hea, or Hoa, the third person in the Babylonian trinity of great gods, may be considered as the serpent-deity, "since there are very strong grounds for connecting him with the serpent of Scripture, and the paradisiacal traditions of the tree of knowledge and the tree of life." The only direct testimony we have of serpent-worship in Babylon is in that part of the Book of Daniel which is now printed separately in the Apocrypha. ("Story of Bel and the Dragon," v. 23 *et seq.*) Of tree-worship no mention has been brought to light in Babylonia; but in Assyria it is among the commonest forms of idolatrous veneration.

Yet Mr. Fergusson says that, "judging *a priori*, I could feel inclined to suggest that the serpent-worship was a peculiarity of the Turanian Babylonians of the old Chaldean Empire, tree-worship that of the Semitic Assyrians." However, he adds that "a great deal has yet to be done before this can either be positively affirmed or rejected." On this we may remark that an *a priori* judgment should not be given at all in such matters, and that the task of an investigator is not to affirm or to reject a theory, but to make possible a solution of his problem by the collection of ample material, even if that material tells against a cherished notion.

When we come to Syria, the snake presents itself as an object of veneration in an impressive manner. The Tyrian coins and other monuments would in themselves suffice to prove the prevalence of serpent-worship on the seaboard of Syria. The coins of Tyre represent in some instances a tree with a serpent coiled round its trunk, and on either hand two rude stone pillars, or an altar with two serpents rising from the angles of its base. Others represent the serpent coiled around a rude stone obelisk, with the Tyrian Hercules contending with a snake.

In ancient Greek mythology we find tree and serpent worship fully developed. Mr. Fergusson, faithful to his theory, assumes that in Greece also there was an original substratum of Turanian (Pelasgian) races, which erected the megalithic polygonal masonry of the walls of the ancient cities, and the so-called tombs, or treasuries, of Mycene and Orchomenus. Upon this early Turanian people the Hellenes of the Aryan stock were afterwards superposed. It was they who introduced greater refinement in architecture and sculpture. Between these two distinct and antagonistic races, the older of which was devoted to serpent-worship, a struggle went on for a considerable time. In all the myths of ancient Greece the destruction of serpents or serpent races plays therefore an important part. After the restoration of the Heraclidæ, when Hellenic supremacy was secured, a kindlier feeling is to be met with in reference to the autochthonic creed. The serpent then became the oracle, the guardian of the city, the healing god; in short, the Agathodæmon.

It will shock many to be told by Mr. Fergusson that the "early Greeks" were Mongols, and that among these Mongols, whom, as Turanians, he considers to be pre-eminently the building race, the germ is to be found of the later and nobler architecture of Hellas. It is true, he qualifies his hypothesis in one sentence by saying that, "if not of purely Turanian race, they must have been so closely allied to that family that, *till the contrary is shown*, they may be considered as belonging to it." But, why throw the burden of the proof upon those who object to this "Turanian" theory? It is rather the duty of the author to furnish us with some strong facts in support

of his own view. He must confess that the Greek language is purely Aryan, and that no traces appear in it of an intermixture with Turanians. He might — though he does not — say that in early Greek, as in Roman sculpture, there are occasionally forms and faces reminding us of the Turanian, with high cheek-bones and flat face. But that would be a very unsafe guide in so dark and difficult a matter as the nature of the early races that inhabited Greece.

Be that as it may, tree and serpent worship is the theme of many an ancient Greek myth. The destruction of the dragon Python by Apollo,* who takes possession of the oracle which the serpent guarded; the conversion of Cadmus and his wife into serpents when they were regarded as objects of veneration; the story of the Argonautic Expedition, which was undertaken to recover a fleece that hung on a tree guarded by a dragon; the strangling of serpents by Hercules; his adventures in the Garden of the Hesperides, which reminds us of the Garden of Eden, though with a different moral; his fight with the Lernæan hydra; on the other hand, his intercourse with the serpent Echidna, through whom he is said to have become the progenitor of the whole race of serpent-worshipping Scythians; the keeping of serpents, at Delphi and other places, for oracular purposes; the serpent-worship at Epidaurus, where stood the temple of Æsculapius and the grove attached to it; the contention between Athene and Poseidon for the guardianship of the city of Athens, when the goddess created the olive, planting it on the Acropolis, and handed over the care of it to the serpent-god Erichthonius; the statement that, when the Persians were approaching Athens, the Athenians, though warned by the oracle, refused to leave their homes till they learned that the great serpent, the guardian of the city, had refused its food and left the place; the curious record concerning the descent of Alexander the Great from a serpent; the part which snakes played in the Bacchic *cultus*, — all these tales show the tenacity of that early form of worship.

As to tree-worship in Greece, there is an elaborate treatise on the subject by a thoroughly competent German scholar,

* There is, in the British Museum, an Apollo Citharoedus, from the temple of Mycene, whose lyre rests on a tree round which a snake is coiled.

Bötticher, — *Baum-Cultus der Hellenen.* Each god of the classical pantheon seems to have had some tree appropriated to him. Among the most familiar instances are the oak or beech of Zeus, the laurel of Apollo, the vine of Dionysus, the olive of Athene, the myrtle of Aphrodite. The apple or orange of the Hesperides belonged to Hera. The poplar was the tree of Hercules, and the plane-tree was the *numen* of the Atridæ. Of sacred groves, such as that at Dodona, Greece had several. It would be easy to multiply these instances. Mr. Fergusson concludes this chapter with the words, —

"When to this we add the purely anthropic and ancestral character of her popular pantheon, we cannot but feel how little title Greece has to that purely Aryan rank which her language would seem to assign to her. There must always have been a very large admixture of Turanian blood in the veins of the inhabitants of that country, varying, of course, in extent in the different states, but except, perhaps, in Sparta, nowhere entirely evanescent."

This latter conclusion, I think, has been arrived at somewhat too hastily. The contest between two distinct races and their creeds we clearly see in ancient Greece. We also see, as it almost everywhere happens where a new faith feels secure in its position, that there is a gradual intermixture between the vanquished and the victorious form of religion. But the question whether these struggles were fought out on Greek soil between a Turanian and an Ayran race, or between two different branches of the latter, is yet to be completely solved; and I think the light we at present have on the subject does not allow us to make a single step with safety in the darkness.

The very fact that there is nothing whatever to prove that the Etruscans were either worshippers of trees or serpents might have induced Mr. Fergusson to hold back from an absolute confidence in the Turanian theory which he has started. He feels evidently the difficulty in which he is placed when treading on Italian ground. He again says that, "reasoning *a priori*," the Etruscans were just such a people as one would suspect of being likely to indulge in such a form of faith. Yet there is nothing to show that they did, although they are generally reckoned to have been of Turanian, or, as Mr. Fergusson puts it, "*quasi* Turanian origin." Why he used the

softening expression is not very clear, since in the case of the early Greeks he spoke with so much confidence, on entirely hypothetical grounds.

I pass over the comparatively few instances of myths and ceremonies connected with the tree and the serpent, to be found among the Latin people of Italy. The influence of Carthage, as well as of Greece, may, perhaps, be traced in them. It is a difficult question to determine how far the representation of serpents on coins may be taken to indicate the existence of such a form of worship in the cities to which they belong. The most remarkable series of coins of this class are those known as "Cistophoroi," belonging to certain towns of Asia Minor, under Roman rule. Mr. Fergusson points to the fact of Christianity having obtained its first and strongest footing in these very cities, and he asks, "Is this coincidence accidental?" His answer is: "If not absolutely, it certainly is nearly correct to assert that no people adopted Buddhism, except those among whom serpent-worship can certainly be traced as pre-existing; and it appears probable that the worshippers of the serpent should, in like manner, be more open to the influence of Christianity than the refined or sceptical Greek or Roman." The words "refined and sceptical" make, of course, all the difference; for the Greeks as a people, according to the author's own showing, were given to that form of worship. This limitation destroys the force of his argument.

The reader will not wonder, after what has preceded, that Mr. Fergusson, on arriving at the chapter on Germany, should say: "We look in vain through the classical authors for any trace of serpent-worship among the Germans, *nor indeed ought we to expect to find any* among a people so essentially Aryan as they are and always were; while, on the other hand, we have not in Germany, as we find in Greece, any traces of that underlying race of less intellectual Turanians, who seem everywhere to have been the serpent-worshippers all over the world." On the other hand, among the purely Teutonic races, the evidences of tree-worship are numerous. Tacitus, in his *Germania*, alludes to it frequently. He distinctly states that the Germans decline to enclose their gods within walls, but consecrate groves and

woods made sacred by pristine awe. Cæsar mentions the same fact. The most frequent reference to the worship is, however, to be found in the earlier Christian writers, when narrating the events accompanying the conversion of the nation to Christianity. Grimm, with his usual industry and intelligence, has collected and arranged these early vestiges in his *Deutsche Mythologie*. The conclusion he arrives at is, that "individual gods might have dwelt on hill-tops, or in caves, or rivers, but the festal universal religion of the people has its abode in woods, and nowhere has another temple yet been found."

The first care of the Christian missionaries, wherever they went, was to cut down the groves of the heathen Germans. They soon discovered, however, that by this course they only excited the wrath of the natives. So they endeavored to conciliate them by the erection of a chapel or church within the sacred precincts of the forest, thus endeavoring to draw them gradually towards the new faith. But there can be no doubt that in the hearts of the people the old veneration for the sacred grove continued to linger. The Christmas-tree is probably a remnant of it. The *Stock-im-Eisen*, at Vienna, the well-known *Wahrzeichen* of the wandering handicraftsmen, may also be noted here. It is said that its cramp-irons were forged by a locksmith's apprentice "devoted to the Devil," that is, to the old heathen religion. Every apprentice, on setting out for his *Wanderjahre*, is to drive a nail into that ancient tree-stump, which now stands in the centre of the Austrian capital, — the last remaining vestige of the sacred grove round which the city has grown up, and in sight of the proud cathedral which has taken the place of its venerable shade.

The serpent at the roots of the ash-tree Yggdrasil, the Midgard snake that coils round the earth, and similar myths, are the echoes of a serpent-worship which has left its traces in the Germanic world. The various *Lindwürmer* — which are not mentioned in the work before us, though they occupy a considerable space in the legends of the mythic heroes that do battle against them — might be interpreted as Mr. Fergusson has interpreted similar subjects in Greek mythology. In the sagas of the Northmen, the snakes are more numerous than the character of their country, which produces but few and feeble specimens

of serpents, would seem to warrant. Mr. Fergusson, by way of explaining this apparent incongruity, goes back once more to the Turanian substratum of Finns and Lapps. He also remarks that, "if a line were drawn from the shores of the Caspian Sea north of the Caucasus, to the mouth of the Vistula or Dwina in the Baltic, it would be coincident with one of the oldest routes of communication between the East and the West, and one that probably was the road by which serpent and tree worship were introduced into the North of Europe. It was the route by which Woden is said to have migrated westward in the first century before Christ, taking with him all that strange mythology which is connected with his name." On this occasion Mr. Fergusson, following, I suppose, the hints thrown out by a German author of note, alludes to the similarity of the name of Wodan, Woden, or Boden with that of Buddha. He also says that "the name of the fourth day of the week being Wodensday in the North, Budhbàr in the East, and *dies Mercurii* in Latin, the confusion that existed in the minds of the Romans between Mercury as the chief god of the Germans, and this Woden, shadow out a thread of tradition which might point to a solution." There are, however, other etymologies of the name of Woden, which have greater plausibility. At any rate, as the author himself remarks, "there are not perhaps in the whole world two religions so diametrically opposed to one another as Buddhism and Wodenism, nor two persons so different as the gentle Sàkya Muni, who left a kingdom, family, and friends, to devote fifty years of his blameless life to the attempt to alleviate the sufferings of mankind, and Odin, 'the terrible and severe god, the Father of Slaughter; he who giveth victory and reviveth courage in the conflict; who nameth those that are to be slain.'"

The Samogitians, the Lithuanians, the Prussians, the Poles, the Livonians of old, were all, according to the writers of some centuries ago, serpent-worshippers. These, I may observe, are all people of Aryan descent. In the northern parts of Sweden, at the time of Bishop Olaus Magnus, snakes were still venerated as household gods. "They are fed with sheep's and cow's milk, and to hurt them is a deadly sin." According to Castrén's *Reise-Erinnerungen* (1838 – 1844),

serpent and tree worship prevailed in Lapland even in his time.

It may be asked whether fire-worship is not to be connected with the veneration of serpents. The same Swedish bishop who has been quoted says that the Poles worshipped fire, serpents, and trees. Now, in German folk-lore, the lightning is represented as a snake. In Indian mythology, also, Vritra, the Dark Spirit of the Clouds, has the additional name of "Ahi" (ἔχις), i. e. serpent, or dragon.* This, as well as the serpent-king, and the dragons that guard hordes of gold, which occur in our popular legends, seems to show that even in Germany the snake played a more important part than Mr. Fergusson acknowledges.

In the chapter on Germany, the author observes: "By whatever name they may have been known, these Ophite races seem, in Europe at least, never to have penetrated far inland from the shore of the sea. The deeply indented coasts of Greece thus presented a singularly favorable locality for their settlement. *They swarmed up the rivers of France*, and the shores of such an inland sea as the Baltic was also well suited to their habits. They were adepts at training lakes or embanking the estuaries of the rivers on which they settled," etc.

I do not know how far it is possible to make out all these primitive settlers as "Ophite races"; but Mr. Fergusson, contrary to what we might expect from his previous remarks, declares, in the chapter on France: "The traces of serpent-worship in Gaul are so few and so evanescent that, in ordinary circumstances, an author would be justified in asserting that it did not exist among the Celts any more than it did among the Germans, and in passing by the subject altogether." But we must then assume, either that Mr. Fergusson's theory of the Turanian character of serpent-worship fails in ancient Gaul, or that he has been over-confident in speaking about "Ophite races" allied, by consanguinity, to the Esthonians and Finns that had "swarmed up the rivers of France." Of tree-worship there are indubitable traces in ancient Gaul, as well as in France down to a comparatively recent time. The Church

* See Mannhardt's *Die Götter der deutschen Mythologie.*

councils of that country, as late as the thirteenth century, denounced those who venerated trees, or fountains, or stones, and declared those guilty of sacrilege who neglected to destroy them.

After the author of the work before us has traced serpent-worship from the East all over Europe, it is strange to find him denying the very possibility of it in the British Isles. From the days of Aubrey and Stukeley, every upright stone had become a Druidical remain, every circle or line of stones an Ophite temple. There was a time, according to British antiquaries, when the Druids ruled absolutely in this land, and when, under their auspices, serpent-worship was as essentially the religion of the people as Christianity is now. Mr. Fergusson desires to extirpate this notion, and he applies himself to the task with great directness, by trying to show that, if there were any Druids at all in Britain at the time of the Roman invasion, they were only to be found among an older and less civilized people, who had already then been driven by the Celts into the fastnesses of the Welsh hills. These, he thinks, may have been serpent-worshippers and sacrificers of human victims; and the uncritical Romans may have confounded the two races. I am afraid that here, again, Mr. Fergusson builds up a distinct theory on too slender a foundation, and is himself guilty of the fault with which he has reproached the British antiquaries. He certainly goes too far when he denies the value of two clear passages in Cæsar's Commentaries* and in Tacitus's Annals;† passages far more distinct and telling than many of those facts or traditions on which Mr. Fergusson has erected an edifice of theories.

He is right, doubtless, in saying that the "Welsh Triads," on which we depend so much for our knowledge of the Druids and their doings, and of serpent-worship in Britain, must be read with some caution, since there is so much mystery regarding the authorship and date of those Triads. But when he

* De Bello Gallico, VI. 13: "Disciplina (Druidum) in Britannia reperta, atque inde in Galliam translata esse existimatur. Et nunc qui diligentius eam rem cognoscere volunt, plerumque illo, discendi causa, proficiscuntur."

† Annals, XIV. 29, where the Druidesses are mentioned who played an important part in the revolt of the islanders of Mona.

goes on to argue in the following way, — "It cannot be said that the word "Druid" does not occur in them, *but if we were not looking for it*, it is hardly in such a manner as would attract attention; and the part they play is most insignificant besides; it is by no means clear to what age or authority such references really belong," — every one must feel that this is cavilling beyond measure. There are, moreover, as he himself mentions, various "dragon" traditions connected with this country. The Saxon abbot Aldred was said to have filled up a great hole which once was the abode of an immense dragon, in a place which at the writer's time was still called the "Wurmenhert." This appears to have been surrounded by a circular *vallum*, which probably still existed in the thirteenth century. Here, beyond question, we have the tradition of an Ophite temple; and one may wonder that Mr. Fergusson does not make the most of that British serpent. There are, furthermore, some traditions in Northumberland, such as that of the Laidley Wurm of Spindleston Heugh; and there was a Wurmhill at Lambton, as well as in other places in that neighborhood.*

When he comes to ask, "What is the evidence on which the Druidical origin of such monuments as Stonehenge and Avebury have been assumed?" Mr. Fergusson replies, "The answer *fortunately* is simple, — absolutely *none*." It is difficult to see why we should congratulate ourselves on the darkness in which we thus are left; for though it may be that the Druids had nothing to do with the erection of those mysterious buildings, there would certainly be no harm if, after all, we found that they had. The carrying out of a favorite theory is certainly of less importance than the actual truth.

Mr. Fergusson's notion is, that the Stonehenge and Avebury structures are not temples at all, but tombs, or cenotaphs, raised on battle-fields. A far more promising field for the investigation of serpent-worship in Britain he finds in Scotland, on the east coast, north of the Forth. In that country, now known as Pictland, there exist, even at the present day, a great number of megalithic monuments, many of them covered with sculptures, among which the serpent appears frequently, and so

* Walter White, Northumberland and the Border.

prominently that it is impossible to doubt that it was considered as an object of veneration by those who erected the monuments. In some instances, such as that of the Newton stone, the serpent is, in Mr. Fergusson's opinion, the object for which the stone was set up. He thinks the age of these sculptured stones to be known with tolerable certainty, "inasmuch as the greater number of them have either the cross itself or Christian emblems engraved upon them, and these must therefore be subsequent to the age of St. Columba, who arrived in Scotland apparently in 563, and died in 597."

But may it not be that some Christian emblems were afterwards added, as heathen idols and ceremonies are elsewhere known to have had their name and significance changed by missionaries, who endeavored gradually to wean the people from Paganism? And can it be said at all that the cross is an exclusively Christian emblem? On Scandinavian Runic stones the cross is found before the time of the conversion of the Northmen. The hammer of the Germanic God of Thunder had the shape of one of the numerous forms of the Christian cross. In Buddhist mythology the cross occurs as an emblem. It was used also by the Indian races of America before the arrival of Europeans on the soil of the New World, as may be read in Brinton's recent work. In the Mexican language it was called "tree of our life," "tree of our flesh"; and it was used by the medicine-men as a charm and means of sorcery. I am inclined to put forth the hypothesis that that form of the cross which is now the most usual — namely, the rectangular one, or the so-called *crux immissa* of the Romans, which occurred also among the Mexicans — may have been the symbol of the living human body; the upright pale representing the trunk with the legs, the cross-beam the extended arms, whose very extension were the proof of life. The name "tree of our life," "tree of our flesh," would thus find its explanation.

On the frequent appearance of the snake symbol in the Scottish district alluded to, Mr. Fergusson observes: "We shall probably not err far if we regard these traces of serpent-worship as indicating the presence, in the Northeast of Scotland, of the head of that column of migration, or of propagandism, which, under the myth of Wodenism, we endeavored in a previous

chapter to trace from the Caucasus to Scandinavia. The Edda seems sufficient to prove that a form of serpent-worship did certainly prevail in the latter country, in the early centuries of the Christian era; and nothing seems more probable or more in accordance with Pictish traditions than that it should have passed thence into Scotland, and should have left its traces everywhere between the Orkneys and the Firths."

After the foregoing it will surely not be wondered at, that in Africa, where the snake tribe is so powerfully represented, there should be a great deal of that form of worship. To this day, the three gods worshipped in Whidah — or, to speak more correctly, the three classes of gods — are serpents, trees, and the ocean, — the same trinity that was established in the Erechtheum, in the Acropolis of Athens, more than three thousand years ago. The human sacrifices, or "customs," as they are called, which accompany the serpent-worship of Dahomey, are too well known to need any special mention.

Nor need the fact be dwelt upon, in an American Review, that great veneration for the serpent existed on the American continent before its discovery by Columbus. Whether or not this should be designated "worship," is not so clear in the opinion of Mr. Fergusson. The absence of any native literature renders it difficult to realize the exact interpretation to be put on any observed phenomena, and we gather very little trustworthy information from the early Christian missionaries or historians. They were either too ignorant, or too prejudiced, not to see the serpent of Eve or the deluge of Noah in the vague traditions of the natives. However, the principal deity of the Aztec pantheon seems Tezcatlipoca, or Tonacatlecoatl; literally, "the Sun-Serpent." The name of the primitive goddess, the wife of Tezcatlipoca, was Cihuacohuatl, or Tonacacihua, — the "Female Serpent," or the "Female Sun." A still more remarkable myth is that of Quetzal-coatl; literally, the "Feathered Serpent." He is represented by some as a stranger coming from a far country, at some time between the sixth and ninth centuries of our era. He was the great lawgiver and civilizer of the inhabitants of Anahuac, — the Lycurgus and Dionysus of Central America. Having finished his mission, he withdrew, — like the Spartan, promising to return.

Mr. Fergusson reminds us that serpent-worship was the faith of a great kingdom in Cambodia at the time just now indicated as the age of the Mexican prophet; and he thinks it more than probable that the worship prevailed in China and the islands to the eastward at that time. He consequently assumes an immigration thence to the western coast of America. On the other hand, he is inclined to throw some doubt on the opinion of those antiquaries of the United States who believe that the great mounds existing there are "serpent-mounds," created by a race of serpent-worshippers before the present race of red Indians inhabited the States of Ohio and Iowa. Of more importance is his remark that in Mexico and among the North American Indians the worshipped serpent "appears occasionally with attributes of terror which were never ascribed to him on this side of the ocean." But he qualifies the remark by saying that, "on the whole, it seems more reasonable to suppose that these characteristics (of terror) are to be ascribed more to the horror of the Christian narrators than to the feelings of the worshippers."

It need hardly be remarked that human sacrifices accompanied serpent-worship in America to almost as great an extent as in Dahomey. The question of tree-worship, of which there are also traces among the American aborigines, has not yet been properly investigated, and the author therefore pauses for further information before attempting to generalize.

From Egypt we have thus roamed through Babylonia, Syria, Greece, Italy, Germany and the countries north and east of it, Gaul, the British Isles, America, and Africa, everywhere meeting with that strange ancient creed. An important field of inquiry, however, has not yet been touched in this article; and this, to which some of the following pages will be devoted, brings us back to the East.

The earliest distinct allusion to those mysterious properties which the ancients attributed to certain trees is to be found, so far as the Bible is concerned, in the second chapter of Genesis. The planting of the trees of life and knowledge is there related; and judging from what follows, it seems that their custody was intrusted to the serpent. This, at least, is the interpretation of Mr. Fergusson. Taken by it-

self, he says, the narrative in question has always appeared one of the least intelligible parts of the Pentateuch, and numberless theories have been formed to clear up its mysterious character. With the knowledge we now possess, the author thinks it is not so difficult to understand what was meant by the curse of the serpent, or the prohibition to eat the fruit of the trees. When the writers of the Pentateuch set themselves to introduce the purer and loftier worship of the Elohim, or of Jehovah, it was first necessary to get rid of that form of faith which the earlier inhabitants of the earth had fashioned for themselves. The serpent, as the principal deity of that early religion, was cursed "above all cattle, and above every beast of the field"; and in future there was to be forever enmity between the serpent and "man of woman born."

Now, a confusion of ideas Mr. Fergusson believes to have arisen on this subject from the assumption that the curse was directed at the reptile for his own sake, and not as the representative of a form of worship which the writers of the Pentateuch must have regarded with horror, and which they thought it necessary to denounce in the strongest terms and in the form which they considered would be most intelligible to those to whom it was addressed. The tree it was not necessary should be cursed. The fruit of the tree of knowledge had been eaten, and no further result could be obtained by access to it; while the tree of life was guarded by a cherub with a flaming sword, and all approach to it prevented. This theory of Mr. Fergusson seems certainly not warranted by the Scriptural text. It can be upheld only on the ground of the transformation and gradual union of different religious systems; and in fact, the author is of opinion that the whole of the first eight chapters of Genesis is made up of fragments of earlier books or earlier traditions, belonging, properly speaking, to Mesopotamian rather than to Jewish history. The history of the Jews and of the Jewish religion begins, he says, with the call of Abraham; and from that time forward the worship of serpents and trees took a far less important position, though still occasionally cropping out, often when least expected, but apparently, however, not as a religion of the Jews, but as a backsliding towards the worship of the older races among whom they were located.

There is no mention of serpents, either in the Bible or in any of the traditions, in connection with Abraham or his immediate descendants. But Mr. Fergusson points to the passage (Gen. xxi. 33) which records that that patriarch "planted a grove at the well of the covenant (Beersheba), and called there on the name of the Lord"; and he considers this, as well as the fact of Abraham having "entertained the angels" under the oak-tree at Mamre, as "the earliest mention of a form of worship to which continual allusions are afterwards made in Jewish history." It is surely going too far to call the simple planting of a grove a "form of worship." In hot countries it is always a useful and desirable thing to plant a tree, and people gladly avail themselves of its shade, even if they are not entertaining angels.

With the time of Moses the indications become more distinct. We gather from the context in the Bible, and still more clearly from the narrative in Josephus, that the tree or bush on Horeb, from which the Lord appeared to Moses as a flame, had been considered sacred before that event. It was, indeed, apparently in consequence of its sanctity that it was chosen for the delivery of the oracle, while the conversion, on that occasion, of Moses' rod into a serpent brings these two objects into the juxtaposition in which they are so frequently found. The repetition of the miracle by Aaron before Pharaoh, whose sorcerers in turn copied it, needs not be dwelt upon.

With the brazen serpent in the wilderness (Num. xxi. 9), we tread on surer ground. It is the first record we have of actual worship being paid to the serpent, and it is remarkable that the cause of this adoration is said to have been its healing powers. From the readiness with which this explanation was adopted by the Jews, it would seem that this characteristic had been ascribed to the serpent previously. We now, however, hear of it for the first time among the Hebrews, though we are so familiar with it in Greek mythology, where the serpent is closely associated with Æsculapius, and is the indispensable attendant of Hygieia.

After the mention of the brazen serpent in the wilderness, there is a sudden break in the records referring to its worship. But it reappears in the time of Hezekiah. We then learn

that the brazen image which Moses had set up had for more than five centuries been preserved in the Temple. It was only then, after six centuries of toleration, that it was resolved to put an end to this idolatry, together with the kindred worship of the groves. King Hezekiah "removed the high places, and brake the images, and *cut down the groves, and brake in pieces the brazen serpent* that Moses had made: for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it: and he called it Nehushtan." (2 Kings xviii. 4.)

In the intermediate period between Moses and Hezekiah, there is hardly an expression that countenances the belief that the worship of serpents generally prevailed among the Jews, unless it be one in the Wisdom of Solomon (xi. 15), where it is said, "They worshipped serpents void of reason." Luther translates, *unvernünftige Würmer*, which may mean serpents, but also any living things that creep. However, the treatment of the prophets, who are always in flight, hiding, fed by ravens, and preaching as voices in the desert, is a clear proof that the monotheism of Israel was not preserved pure under all circumstances. The very expression "*Eloah Elohim*," points to a confusion of a monotheistic and a polytheistic creed. As a matter of history, we know of the repeated lapse of the Jewish tribes into polytheism and idolatry.

The first form of tree-worship, Mr. Fergusson says, appears to have arisen among the Jews from the veneration paid to natural groves, and the worship offered therein to Baal and other foreign gods. But the grove, or *asherah*, is also frequently an image, like that emblem, no doubt, so often represented on the Assyrian sculptures. This is an artificial tree, such as might have been placed alongside of the brazen serpent within the Temple of Jerusalem. It hardly admits of doubt that the worship of the *asherah*, or of groves, was a true and essential form of tree-worship, but it seems to have been local, and entirely opposed to the spirit of the Jewish religion. As a rule, it is reprobated by Jewish chroniclers and prophets, and eventually disappears.

With regard to serpent-worship, there is nothing either in the Bible or in the Talmud to justify the assertion that it had prevailed, in however modified a form, among the Jews, after its

abolition by Hezekiah. At least, Mr. Deutsch, of the British Museum, who has made important researches in Talmudic literature, and whose recent interpretation of the Phœnician mason-marks on the foundation-stones of the Temple at Jerusalem has attracted much attention, declares, after having looked through the Talmud with reference to the question, that he has not found in it any traces of serpent-worship.

Yet it is remarkable that, though serpent-worship may have been in abeyance for some time in Judæa, it burst forth again with wonderful vigor immediately after the Christian era, in the sects of the Nicolaitans, the Gnostics, and more especially in that called the Ophites, or serpent-worshippers, from ὄφις, a serpent. Of the latter, Tertullian tells us: "They even prefer the serpent to Christ, because the former brought the knowledge of good and evil into the world. They point also to his majesty and power, inasmuch as when Moses raised the brazen serpent in the wilderness, whoever looked on it was healed; and they even quote the Gospels to prove that Christ was an imitation of the serpent, because it is said, 'As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up.'"

Epiphanius describes the Ophite ceremonies in the following terms: "They keep a living serpent in a chest, and at the time of the mysteries entice him out by placing bread before him. The door being opened, he issues forth, and having ascended the table folds himself above the bread. This they call a perfect sacrifice. They not only break and distribute this among the votaries, but whosoever wishes it may kiss the serpent. This the wretched people call the Eucharist. They conclude the ceremonies by singing a hymn through him to the Supreme Father." There are other passages to the same effect. It is well known that the representations of serpents and serpent-worship in the so-called Gnostic form have been very numerous. There is in Fergusson's work a copy of a "cista," with the serpent coming out and licking the bread, taken from a Roman coin of Adramyttium.

We have no means of knowing how long the worship of the serpent continued to prevail in Syria, but most probably it lasted down to the seventh century, when the Mahommedan

invasion swept away a large mass of the parasitic superstitions which had fastened themselves on Christianity. The literature of that age, however, is so mixed up with fables that it is difficult to write confidently about anything which we learn from it.

When all that has hitherto been said is taken into account, it may appear strange that the easternmost branch of our subject has been much less thoroughly investigated than the divisions noticed in the preceding pages. Thus we have, so far as is yet known, no material remains of snake-worship in Persia. The Zend-Avesta is the work from which we might hope to learn most; but "it is," says Mr. Fergusson, "of very little use for our present purpose, inasmuch as it, like the Vedas, embodies the religious belief only of the Aryan, or, as they are called here, the Iranian branch of the Persian people; and it need hardly be repeated here that they are not, and never were, serpent-worshippers anywhere." However, when we come to later, Mohammedan, writers, we meet with legends pointing to a serpent-worshipping race even in Persia. And to the preservation of this race, in Mr. Fergusson's opinion, is probably due that remarkable development of Buddhism which distinguished the valley of the Cabul River between the decline of the Greco-Bactrian kingdom and the rise of the Mohammedan power in that quarter.

The last material trace of serpent-worship in Persia occurs in a bas-relief at Nakshi-Rustem, near Persepolis. It represents Ormuzd bestowing the circlet of royalty on Ardishir Babegàn, the first king of the Sassanian line (A. D. 226). Beneath the feet of the horse on which the god (?) is seated lies Ardevan, the last of the Parthians, and round his head are twisted two writhing snakes, sufficiently prominent to mark that the sculptor intended to represent the Parthian as of the hated race of Zohàk, the follower of the accursed Ahriman, whom Ormuzd tramples under foot, while bestowing the emblem of royalty on the Zoroastrian, fire-worshipping Sassanian. Mr. Fergusson says: —

"The more closely it is looked at, the more probable does it appear that, not only in this instance, but throughout the whole ancient history of Persia, the so-called dualism is much more an ethnographical ex-

pression than the result of any theological elaboration. It was the opposition of Turan to Iran, of Zohak to Zoroaster, of Ormuzd to Ahriman; an Aryan race, with their pure elemental worship, intruding into a country occupied by a serpent-worshipping people of Turanian origin; but instead of totally abolishing and ignoring the religion of the conquered, forcing it into an unnatural combination with their own. All this, however, was carried out in such a manner as to represent their own as the source of all that is good and elevated, and that of the subject race as all that is evil and accursed."

But then, may it not have been that a dualism had already been "theologically elaborated" *before* those struggles, and that the evil principle was only afterwards found by the conquering race to be represented in the conquered? In this way, of course, a moral title, a divine sanction, was conferred upon the conquest.

One of the principal centres of snake-worship in Asia is unquestionably Cashmere. The Aryans, on entering India, do not seem to have turned aside to conquer, or at least permanently to occupy, that valley. Hence the Nagas, or snake-worshipping tribes of that northwestern country had, in our author's view, little to contend with. I understand, however, from a Sanskrit savant, who is one of the first authorities on this subject, that this very part of Mr. Fergusson's work, in which he seems to be treading on the surest ground, will be partially contested in an essay at present in course of preparation. The latest account we have of the prevalence of snake-worship in Cashmere is that of Abulfazl, who tells us that in the reign of Akbar (1566–1605) there were in Cashmere forty-five places dedicated to the worship of Siva, sixty-four to Vishnu, three to Bramâ, and twenty-two to Durgâ; but there were seven hundred places in the valley where there were carved images of snakes which the inhabitants worshipped.

There is another country, to which a passing allusion has been made before, on the other side of the Bay of Bengal, the study of whose antiquities is nearly as important to the elucidation of serpent-worship in India as those of Cashmere: it is Cambodia. Its ruined cities have however been so recently discovered, and are still so little known, that a wholly satisfactory conclusion cannot yet be arrived at. However, the great temple

of Nakhon Val was at any rate wholly dedicated to serpent-worship. Every angle of every roof is adorned with a grim seven-headed serpent, with a magnificent crest of what appears to be intended for feathers; and every cornice of every entablature is adorned with a continuous row of those seven-headed deities, but without crests. The former may be counted by hundreds, the latter by thousands. Every balustrade, every ridge, almost every feature of the building, bears the same impress. Neither in India nor elsewhere, so far as is known, is there any other temple displaying the same amount of patient labor devoted to the elaboration of ornament over so extended a surface as in this newly discovered temple. The startling thing is that, simultaneously with the erection of the great cathedrals of York, Amiens, or Cologne, a larger and more magnificent temple than either of them was building in another part of the globe, and that all knowledge of such a building should have so completely passed away that till within the last ten years no one suspected its existence.

The dragon of the "Flowery Empire," though he has been invested with wings and teeth and claws, is naturally claimed by Mr. Fergusson. So likewise are the two heaven-sent serpents that watched over the first washing of Kon-fu-tse, or Confucius. From a Chinese work entitled "The Great Cloud Wheel Rain asking Sutra," and printed in its present form under the auspices of Keen Lung, in 1783 of our era, a woodcut is copied into Mr. Fergusson's work, representing a Naga temple, with a deity whose head is surrounded by seven snakes.

In Australia there are serpent traditions. Ceylon also, so far as we can gather from Buddhist scriptures, was inhabited by a Naga race of serpent-worshippers at the time when the conversion of that island to Buddhism took place; and of tree-worship there are, in Ceylon, most unmistakable proofs. The great Bo-tree, sent by Asoka, has been worshipped for the last two thousand years, and is still. The city where it stands is in ruins; its great dagobas have fallen into decay; its monasteries have disappeared: but the great Bo-tree still flourishes, according to the legend, "ever green, never growing or decreasing, but living on forever for the delight and worship of man-

kind." There is probably no older idol in the world, and certainly none more venerated.

When we come at last to India proper, we meet with a difficulty in getting at a knowledge of the character of the early forms of religion prevailing there. Whilst the countries of Central Asia were for a long time united under one sceptre and subject to one code of laws, no native tradition represents India as ever united under one rule. When the Greeks visited it, they found it divided into a hundred and twenty-two different nations. The division, in one form or another, continued till towards the end of the seventeenth century, when the Moguls nearly succeeded in rendering their sway paramount in India.

This complex character of the political history of India renders the history of the religions existing there much more difficult to follow. However, according to our present knowledge, it seems certain that no Semitic element ever existed among the Indian populations. But from the earliest times we find two well-defined and perfectly distinct races: one, the Aryan, or Sanskrit-speaking race, entered India, it is supposed, across the upper Indus, and eventually spread over the whole of the valley of the Ganges, and the countries between the Vindhya and the Himalaya Mountains; the other, a Turanian race, known as the Dravidians, and speaking Tamul, or languages closely allied to it, entered India probably earlier than the Aryans, but across the lower Indus, and now occupy the southern part of the peninsula, nearly up to the Vindhya Mountains.

Now it is somewhat mortifying to find, after all that has been said by Mr. Fergusson of the Turanians, that "it does not appear that the Dravidian races ever were essentially or to any great extent serpent-worshippers, or ever were converted to Buddhism," though "the three leading features of that faith — atheism, metempsychosis, and absence of caste — are essentially Turanian, and found everywhere among people of that race."

In order to get rid of this difficulty, Mr. Fergusson says: "It *becomes necessary to assume* the existence in the valley of the Ganges of a people differing from the Dravidians, and more closely allied to the Thibetans, the Burmese, and the Indo-Chinese races." In other words, — failing to find serpent-wor-

shippers among those Turanians whose existence admits of proof, our author supposes a deeper substratum of Turanians, whom he clothes with the serpent-worshipping attribute. It may be that he is right in this hypothesis, but it looks somewhat arbitrary. He then goes on to say: "Assuming this view of the matter to be correct, we shall of course look in vain in the Vedas, or any of the earlier writers in Sanskrit, for any trace of serpent-worship. Not only was it repugnant to their own [the Aryans'] feelings, but they so utterly despised the Dasyus, — or by whatever other name they chose to designate the aborigines, — that they would not even condescend to notice their superstitions."

The traditions from which the great epic, the Râmâyana, was compiled also represent a state of Aryan society comparatively so pure that there is probably no mention of Nagas in it. But the heroes of the Mahâ-Bhârata were of a race much less pure. They represent a second great horde of the Aryan stock, the so-called "Lunar" race, and they seem to have entered India at least a thousand years after the purer, so-called "Solar," race. The earliest seat to which we can trace back the former seems to be Takt-i-Bahai, north of Peshawur. Thence, passing through the Punjab, we find them settled between the Jumna and the Ganges, about the thirteenth century before Christ, when the real action of the poem begins.

Now, the Mahâ-Bhârata, "which may practically be considered," says Mr. Fergusson, "as one of the books of the Hindu Bible, actually opens, like the Pentateuch, with a curse on the serpent." Then follow stories about a serpent race, in which wild fables are inextricably mixed up with what may be a dimly distinguishable nucleus of historical facts. It is useless for our purpose to enter into these myths. Of more importance seems the statement that the traditions of the Mahâ-Bhârata still cling to the identical spots mentioned in it, and that serpent-worship still prevailed there in 1836; at least it would so appear from what Major Kittoe reported at that time from Sumbulpore. Still, this part of Mr. Fergusson's work is the most meagre in material; and he can only say that he has "no doubt that numerous other deities of the same sort could easily be found if only looked for; but attention has never

hitherto been directed to the subject." In an Appendix he gives, however, two memoranda from Colonel Meadows Taylor, so well known through his various works on subjects connected with India, and from Mr. A. Vans Best, M. D., of the Bengal Establishment, tending to show that snake-worship still prevails in India. According to these authorities, although it ordinarily is found among the descendants of aboriginal tribes, even Brahmins take part in it, at least in the whole South, from the Nerbudda to Cape Comorin. Lingayets, who are schismatics from Hinduism, and deny *in toto* the religious supremacy of the Brahmins, are pre-eminently snake-worshippers; many of them bearing the name "Nâg," — both male and female.

We now come to Buddhism, to the form it gradually assumed, and to the topes of Sanchi and Amravati, which are illustrated in Mr. Fergusson's work.

Buddhism he takes to be "little more than a revival of the superstitions of the aboriginal races, purified and refined by the application of Aryan morality, and elevated by doctrines borrowed from the intellectual superiority of the Aryan races." For the possibility of this Turanian revival he accounts in this way: From the earliest dawn of tradition the great underlying stratum of the population of India seems to have been Turanian, — very unwarlike, and incapable of any rise in civilization, except through admixture of blood. This was furnished by succeeding invasions of hardier races from the countries now known as Bokhara and Afghanistan. Horde after horde crossed the Indus, retained for a time its freshness and vigor, but by degrees, partly from the enervating influence of the climate, but more from intermixture with the aborigines, sank to the lower level of the indigenous inhabitants, and in their turn became a prey to the next horde that followed in the steps of their forefathers. Now, from the thirteenth century before Christ to the third or fourth of our era, that is, for more than one thousand years, no hordes of any race, so far as we know, crossed the Indus. The causes of this we are not at present able to detect. However, during the long period mentioned, the blood of the Aryans in India had become so mixed with that of other races that it was no longer possible to observe the Veda as a rule of faith. When Buddha, or Sâkyamuni, attempted to revive the

religion of the aboriginal Turanians, his call was responded to in a manner which led to the most important religious consequences to all the Turanian families of mankind.

Buddha himself was, in Mr. Fergusson's opinion, "undoubtedly of purely Aryan race."* He was the descendant of a junior branch of the "Solar" kings of Ayodhyâ: of royal descent, as the founder of the Christian religion is represented to have been; like him, also, he withdrew to a solitude before devoting himself to his task of religious regeneration. The birth of Buddha is now assumed to have occurred about the year 623 B. C.; his death, in 543 B. C. The dissemination of his religion is mainly due to the accident of its having been adopted by the low-caste kings of Magadhà, and to its having been elevated by one of them to the rank of the religion of the state. During the first three centuries after its promulgation, Buddhism had been a struggling faith, sometimes favored, sometimes persecuted. After that time, King Asoka did for it what Constantine did for Christianity. Three hundred years later, Nâgârjuna the patriarch (whose name is singularly suggestive, being compounded of "Naga," a serpent, and "Arjuna," the name of a tree under which he was born), together with Kanishka, the Tartar king of Cashmere and Northern India, did for the Buddhist faith what St. Benedict and Gregory did for Latin Christianity. Along the Ganges monasteries now sprung up, in which shaven monks, living in celibacy, devoted themselves to practices reminding us strangely of those of the Latin Church, and all this before Christianity had even been founded! A little later, numerous "topes" and "chaityas" were erected, which in structure and internal arrangements curiously resemble Christian churches. Thus the cave chaitya of Karli,

* The curly, almost woolly, hair on the head of the statues of Buddha has puzzled many antiquarians; and as not a few of the statues are of black stone, a theory has been started that Buddha was of African descent. However, many other Indian statues were executed in black stone; and as to the curly hair, it certainly occurs among some German populations of "purely Aryan descent," especially Franconians, Allemanns, and also Low Saxons, amidst people who generally have long, straight, or flowing hair. I have, however, looked at a number of Buddha statues, and I cannot divest myself of the idea that his face has a thickish, more Assyrian than "purely Aryan" look, suggestive of a cross between a Semite and a Turanian or Mongol. At the same time, one of the races represented on the Sanchi and Amravati sculptures has a very clear, noble, "Solar" type.

with its arches in "Gothic" style, is said to have an extraordinary resemblance to the cathedral in Canterbury.*

Now, when Buddha introduced his religious reform, "tree-worship was adopted as an important part of the new faith," but "serpent-worship was utterly rejected." So Mr. Fergusson wrote in 1866, in the second volume of his "History of Architecture." When in the following spring he discovered the Amravati sculptures in the coach-house at Fife House, he hastened to add, on the last page, a recantation or at least modification of this assertion. Further investigations now incline him to go back to his first statement. The serpent, he now believes, was rejected by Buddha and his earlier followers, but reappeared in later times, among other corruptions, and then became an important element in Buddhist mythology.

The gateways at Sanchi were erected, as nearly as can be ascertained, in the first half of the first century of our era, and were, therefore, nearly contemporary with Nâgârjuna. Buddha never appears in them as an object of worship. The tree, and other such emblems, are reverenced; but the serpent appears rarely. At Amravati, three centuries afterwards, Buddha is worshipped, but the Naga appears as his coequal. With fuller investigation, Mr. Fergusson thinks we shall arrive at results even more startling. He says: —

"The truth of the matter seems to be that attention has not hitherto been especially directed to the subject, and till this is the case the most obvious evidences might be passed without being noticed. As an instance of this, I may perhaps be allowed to quote against myself what occurred at Ajanta. I spent a considerable time in exploring these caves, but my mind was full of architecture. I measured everything, drew every detail, and familiarized myself with every architec-

* The chaitya caves are almost exact counterparts of Christian churches, and consist of a central nave, at the inner end of which stands the dagoba, or stone altar, either containing or professing to contain a relic. Round this and along either side runs an aisle which is entered by one of three doors, which open outwardly under a gallery corresponding to the roodloft of Christian churches.

The tope is a solid circular pyramid of brick or stone. Mr. Fergusson assumes it to be the lineal descendant of the funereal tumulus, which, from the earliest age to which our knowledge extends, the Turanian races, and probably some others, raised over the graves of their dead. The tope in India was, however, used as a relic-shrine; never, apparently, as a tomb. It was also very commonly used as a memorial tower to mark a sacred spot.

tural affinity. But neither then nor subsequently did I note the presence of any Nagas. Now, that my attention is turned to it, I find in drawings and photographs twelve or fifteen sculptured representations of the seven-headed Naga; and there may be many more. I now also recollect seeing Nagas in all the Jaina temples at Abu, at Sudree, and elsewhere, but I then passed them over. Now I cannot take up a photograph of any temple belonging to the group of religions which include the Buddhist, Jaina, or Vaishnava faiths, without seeing snakes everywhere, but in places where neither I nor any one else detected them before."

In the sculptured representations at Sanchi, the serpent is only once worshipped, and then apparently by a people totally distinct from the governing race which erected the gateways and carved the representations upon them. But groups occur six, or it may be ten, times, in which a man sits shielded by the seven-headed Naga, and surrounded by women who have the strange accompaniment of a single snake at the back of their heads. But at Amravati, the snake occurs ten or twelve times in the places of honor on the dagoba, or on pillars, as the principal object to be worshipped. Twice he occurs in a similar position, shielding the head of Buddha; thrice, protecting the sacred feet; and at least thirty, and it may be fifty, times, spreading his hood over rajahs, or persons of importance, exclusive of the women with single snakes, who are always more numerous. The people most distinctly characterized in the sculptures of these two topes, Mr. Fergusson believes to be Dasyus. They appear in both places as a quasi-aboriginal race, are treated as inferiors by the builders of the topes, and seem to be the real and original serpent-worshippers. The people who are associated with Buddha in both topes "are the mixed race of Bengal,—a people with a certain infusion of Aryan blood, but which had become so mixed with that of the aboriginal tribes that the distinctive features of the higher civilization were almost entirely lost."

A word may here be said with reference to the different stages in the art of building. Stone architecture in India commences, according to Mr. Fergusson's showing, with the age of Asoka (B. C. 250). Not only have we as yet discovered no remains whatever of stone buildings anterior to his reign, but all the earliest cave temples show the architectural art in the

first stage of transition from wood to stone. Whether looked at from an archæological, architectural, or ethnographic point of view, this wooden origin of Indian Buddhist architecture is one of the most interesting facts connected with the subject. The Aryan races, according to Mr. Fergusson, are not builders. "All the literature of India is Aryan, all the architecture Turanian." The Aryans "always had too firm a conviction of the immortality of the soul, and consequently of the existence of a future state, ever to care much for a brick or stone immortality in this world. . . . . The Turanians, on the contrary, never rose to a distinct idea of an external God nor of a future state, but supplied the place of the latter by metempsychosis and final annihilation. . . . . It was when these Turanians first came into power that permanent architecture was thought of in India; and as they grew in strength and their influence extended, so did their architecture acquire consistency, and spread over the length and breadth of the land."

This is startling; but that Mr. Fergusson should not have thought it necessary to attempt to reconcile the existence of the splendid Greek, Roman, and what is called Gothic architecture, with this favorite theory of his, is even more startling. Or are we to assume the Turanians to have been the authors of all these? In his "History of Architecture," Mr. Fergusson certainly treats that question; but how? In a foot-note he simply says: "Had there been no Pelasgi [in his opinion, Turanians] in Greece, there probably would have been no architecture of the Grecian period." Now, with all due regard for the author's great architectural knowledge, most men, I suppose, will find it as difficult to agree with such an off-hand dictum as with the same writer's declaration that "the division of human society into classes or *castes* is not only the most *natural* concomitant of the division of labor, but also the most beneficent of the institutions of man." * In such assertions an eccentricity crops out which it is difficult to reconcile with the otherwise calm reasoning of the writer, and with the great power of research he has unquestionably shown. Whilst taking, therefore, his recent work as a valuable contribution to our knowledge of an ancient creed, I think some caution is neces-

* History of Architecture, p. 68.

sary in accepting his generalizations. The material he has furnished is, however, rich; and though he is indebted for much of it to the labors of learned predecessors, he has so shaped and worked it over that, whatever flaws and extravagances may be found in his theory, his book will remain most suggestive, and will certainly lead to further discoveries, the range and importance of which it is impossible at present even to guess.

KARL BLIND.

ART. IV. — RAILWAY PROBLEMS IN 1869.

THE administration of President Grant and the sessions of the Forty-first Congress opened on the 4th of March, 1869. The houses of Congress remained in session only until the 9th of April. During that brief interval ample evidence was afforded that the precedent established in the case of the Pacific Railway, in respect both to the aid which had been so liberally granted by the national government for its construction, and to the disposition made of that aid through the machinery, auxiliary to its construction, known as the Credit Mobilier, had not been lost upon an unobservant public. During those twenty-six working-days no less than twenty-three bills were introduced into the Senate, providing for the construction of 14,050 miles of railway which unaided private capital could not be induced to build, and appropriating to the furtherance of the work 224,245,520 acres of the national domain, or nearly one half of the whole amount of territory now remaining unoccupied. The demand for appropriations did not stop here. In certain cases liberal subsidies in money also were asked, and, under the provisions of three bills alone, the government was to become responsible for nearly seven millions of annual interest on more than one hundred and fifteen millions of capital indebtedness.* Most people have heard of that law which the

---

* International Pacific Road, Sen. Bill No. 134, $22,500,000 Int. $1,350,000
32d-Parall.-of-Lat. Road, Sen Bill No. 165, 64,000,000 " 3,800,000
Pacific Central Transit, Sen. Bill No. 188, 30,000,000 " 1,800,000
Totals, ... $116,500,000 $6,950,000

late Senator Benton emphatically described as "a bill with a stump-speech in its belly"; but it is not, probably, too much to say that each of these still pending measures contains within it the germ of a Credit Mobilier.

It is not proposed at this time to pass in review the history of the construction of the Pacific Railway, or of its connection with the mysterious institution just referred to, even in so far as the facts have yet been made public. Such a narrative might indeed afford a timely lesson to the American people; but if attempted at all, it must be at some future day. Meanwhile public attention cannot be too soon or too pointedly called to the alarming activity which the supposed pecuniary success of those who undertook the construction of that pioneer road has given to the most dangerous and corrupting form of all legislation. Bills which have "money in them" are the bane of representative government. It is currently supposed — whether correctly or not is of no consequence, so far as the effect on legislation is concerned — that the constructors of the Union Pacific Railway and the stockholders of the Credit Mobilier made on the "job," if it may be so called, some seven hundred and fifty per cent on the amount of capital embarked. Doubtless the persons severally interested in the enactment by Congress of the twenty-three bills introduced into the Senate between the 5th of March and the 9th of April last are fully persuaded, each, that the passage of his particular bill involves for him a no less profitable return.

The people of this country should have obtained two things, almost equally valuable, from the completion of the Pacific Railway, — the first a trans-continental road, and the second the wisdom which comes from dearly purchased experience. Very likely the money cost of the Pacific Railway, great as it was, and lavish as the method of construction is understood to have been, was not excessive. The country demanded the thoroughfare, and was willing to pay for it; it made its own contract for the work of construction, and yet retains the power to enforce the terms of that contract. It has therefore little right to complain if the daring and energetic men, who risked their whole fortunes in the work of forcing through a novel enterprise to a splendid success, now claim to the uttermost

farthing the great stakes for which they played so well. At the same time, after the lesson has been paid for, it should not be forgotten.

In a moral and political point of view, there is nothing more dangerous than this fostering of special interests; for the legislation which effects it inevitably becomes a precedent, to the application of which there is no limit. Our own history is full of examples of this evil. Instances without number might be cited from applications of what is known as the protective policy. Never, however, when this course of legislation has once been entered upon, has all the protection been granted, — nor could it be, — which special interests have called for. No law of supply and demand operates in this case, for the simple reason that the whole policy is based on the stimulation of a supply in excess of the natural demand. Natural laws are interfered with; and the moment such an interference is attempted, an unlimited field for special legislation is opened. The law of compensation then begins to operate. An unnatural development has been attained, and an unnatural condition results. Greedy interests are stimulated into existence, which clamor for public support in the name of justice, set in motion every element of corruption, and inculcate every fallacy, until the original interference, which was, perhaps, in itself justifiable, has generated a vast progeny of jobs. These intrigue and combine and coalesce, until a system of political "rings," legislative "log-rolling," and organized "lobbies" results; and then, at last, the evil becoming intolerable, the community sluggishly grapples with it in a struggle for self-preservation. Thus it is, in the cant of the day, that a certain class of evils work their own cure.

The United States government may now fairly be considered as committed to a policy of lending encouragement, through direct material aid, to an indefinite expansion of railways. It is many years since the precedent was established of granting tracts of public land in aid of railroad construction. While the demands of the companies were limited to this, little objection could be made to them. Land speculations, of course, took the form of railroad enterprises; but it was so evidently the policy of the government to dispose of unoccupied lands, in order to promote their settlement, that the abuse was not a

crying one. The assistance asked for was not, however, long confined within these limits. In the case of the Pacific Railway, for the first time, a money as well as a land subsidy was granted to a railroad enterprise. The record of the first few weeks of the Forty-first Congress gives the country, if it only heeds it, a very clear intimation of the use which is to be made of the precedent thus established. It is not necessary to seek in other interests for illustrations of the extent to which this principle may be pushed; for the history of railroads in this country affords cases sufficiently in point. One may be found in the legislation of Massachusetts. This State committed itself to the policy of interfering in railroad development in the year 1836, by subscribing to the extent of ten thousand shares of stock in aid of the construction of a line of road which was to connect Boston with Albany and the West. This was, at the time, looked upon as an exceptional case, in favor of which a time-honored policy of non-interference with industrial development was to be set aside. The end once attained, it was supposed that no occasion for a new violation of the rule would arise. The precedent was, however, established, and the usual consequences followed. A third of a century has since passed away, and Massachusetts is to-day more deeply involved in new and doubtful railroad enterprises than in any previous year of her history. Not a session of her legislature passes, that demands are not presented on her credit, each year in language more imperative. The exceptional action of 1836 has become the rule of 1869. As a result of this system, the State has been drawn on, step by step, into unforeseen entanglements, until it is now straining its credit as it painfully carries through two thoroughly bankrupt private enterprises. To the north, but within the State limits, the Hoosac Tunnel is slowly progressing towards completion at an actual outlay, already provided for, of $8,000,000 of public money; while to the south, in Central Connecticut and Eastern New York, $5,000,000 more are being expended on the Boston, Hartford, and Erie Railroad. What further sum, in addition to those already obtained, these enterprises may exact before their completion, cannot now be accurately computed; but it will hardly fall short of $5,000,000. The example furnished to all who choose to give heed to it

does not stop here. The evil would be trifling were it confined to a liability for $14,000,000 or $24,000,000, or indeed to the actual loss of such large sums. Unfortunately, the whole atmosphere of legislation has been corrupted. Money is not, perhaps, received as a bribe, but all the machinery of special class legislation has been called into existence. Each new scheme counts its phalanx of disciplined supporters, who look eagerly round for other bands with similar ends in view, until at last the subsidy-mendicants are welded into a majority. Each new precedent helps to establish a fixed policy of lavish appropriation, and what was formerly petitioned for as a favor is now demanded as a right.

Such have been the results of a single dangerous precedent, established only thirty-three years ago in one State. It only remains to apply this experience to the larger national conditions. The United States entered on the policy of money subsidies in 1862: should its progress in that path be at the same rate as that of Massachusetts has been, — and Massachusetts, be it remembered, is one of the more conservative States of the Union, — then it will be safe to say that, by the year 1890, the national government will be involved in the affairs of railroad corporations, two thirds of them insolvent, to the extent of $600,000,000; it will find itself compelled to assume directly the completion, if not the management, of the most hopelessly bankrupt and unpromising roads, — and, not of one or two alone; and finally, except in the extremely improbable event of the development of legislative morality proceeding *pari passu* with the development of temptation and of the means of corruption, the moral condition of the government will have become unendurable.

The effects on legislation, likely to ensue from the completion of the Pacific Railway, are not, however, those which most excite the interest of our people; and, in whatever aspect we regard the subject, it furnishes abundant food for reflection. The material, the moral, and the political interests involved are found to be inseparably connected, and the one leads to the other, in some unexpected way, no matter from what side this railroad problem is approached. Take, for instance, the phase of corporate consolidation, through which the railway system

is now so rapidly passing, and to which the completion of the Pacific Railway has recently given a prodigious impulse. It is only seventeen years since the New York Central was composed of ten independent links connecting the Hudson with the Lakes, all of which were as distinct then as are the larger links connecting New York and San Francisco now. The consolidation of these roads was the result of a natural law, rather than of any enactment of the Legislature of New York. Under the operation of this same law, the only question is, how soon a consolidation of the roads forming some one of the connecting lines between the Missouri River and the Atlantic will carry the Pacific Railway across the continent. The progress in this direction is too evident to escape observation. Ever since the completion of the Pacific Railway could be counted on as a definite result, every prominent road in the East has been hard at work securing, through consolidation, perpetual leases, or close contracts, a connection with the single trunk road. There are four of these great roads, leading to the four Atlantic seaports.

The Baltimore and Ohio, farthest to the south, controlling in its trunk line and branches 523 miles of track, represented by some $45,000,000 of capital, has also obtained the ownership by lease of other routes to Cincinnati and Lake Erie, representing 305 miles more of track and $20,000,000 additional capital. Starting afresh at Cincinnati, this great company has recently effected close connections with Chicago and St. Louis through lines of which it has obtained practical control; until now it is, to all intents and purposes, the master of over 820 miles of road and $85,000,000 of property, in place of the $31,000,000 it represented eight years ago.

This growth, however, is trifling compared with that of the Pennsylvania Central. In 1861 this company returned, according to its balance-sheet, a capital of $34,234,559; it is now, perhaps, the richest and most powerful single corporation in the world. Within the last year its development has been unprecedented, and would furnish a curious page in the history of railway intrigues and legislative manipulation. Early in 1869 the Erie Railway managers sought to cut off the connections of the Pennsylvania Central and to shut it up

within the limits of Pennsylvania. For a brief time the battle seemed to go against the latter, but suddenly the tide turned. Bills in the interest of this company, which it was doubtful if it were in the power of any legislature to pass, were pushed through their various stages, and received executive approval, with a speed unprecedented; contracts, arranged with the Erie managers by boards of directors, were unexpectedly rejected in meetings of stockholders; and for a time this irresistible power even threatened to wrest from the Erie road its own peculiar and long-established connections. The result of these operations is that the Pennsylvania Central now owns by perpetual lease a whole system of roads radiating to all points in the West and Southwest. By one it reaches Chicago, by another St. Louis, and by a third Cincinnati. At Indianapolis it has absorbed a network of routes; at Chicago it has formed a connection, which will probably soon result in a perpetual lease, with the Rock Island, which carries it directly on to the eastern terminus of the Union Pacific. It is difficult accurately to state either the miles of track or the amount of property included in this vast consolidation; it is probably safe to estimate the first at 2,700 miles and the last at $160,000,000.

The Erie Railway has been less fortunate in its efforts, the result of which now presents the curious spectacle of a number of bankrupt roads bolstering each other up, and trying to produce strength out of a united weakness. The record of certain of these roads presents probably the most discreditable page in the financial history of railways. The combination connects New York and St. Louis by 1,200 miles of unbroken, broad-gauge track, and has also made great progress in the direction of Chicago. The utter insolvency of the Erie Railway, and the depth of disrepute into which its management has fallen, and drawn everything connected with it, places this combination, in comparison with others, at a great disadvantage. Nominally it may now represent some $200,000,000 of stock and indebtedness; but under the processes by which these have been created, they might just as well represent twice that amount, while it is perhaps safe to estimate its property at $125,000,000 of real capital.

Last and greatest of all comes the New York Central, or

Vanderbilt, combination. This controls, within the limits of New York alone, under one head and as the property of one man, 974 miles of track, now represented by about $125,000,000 of paper securities. This, however, is but a small portion of the power of that combination of which Commodore Vanderbilt is the central figure. Beyond the limits of New York the Michigan Central and the Great Western of Canada depend wholly on the closeness of their connection with this interest; and to the South, a great consolidated line, which stretches out its branches through five States and over 900 miles of track, from Buffalo to Chicago, has recently, after a long conflict, passed under its practical control. At Chicago it branches again through a treble connection, to join hands with the Pacific Railway. These roads are bound together by no consolidation or perpetual leases; in some cases even their interests are antagonistic. For the present, however, they are welded to each other by geographical necessities or by the wealth and personal influence of one man, and, as they appear united around the direction of the New York Central, they represent the control of nearly 5,000 miles of track and more than $300,000,000 of capital. In the case of the Pennsylvania Central the consolidation is complete, and a corporation is the centre; in the case of the New York Central the combination is temporary and depends upon a single life.* The diverse interests are, however, so curiously brought together by so many influences, that, while Vanderbilt lives, it is scarcely possible that he will not remain the head of the largest combination of private capital in existence.

Thus, practically, State lines are done away with by corporations created by States. The machinery of civilization has entirely outgrown the system of government under which it was organized, and has neutralized many of the fundamental laws which regulate the control and disposition of property.

* Several of the roads included in this combination, as, for instance, the Boston and Albany, and the Michigan Central and its connections, are anxious, as is well known, to keep themselves independent of it; but, while the Erie is under its present direction, Vanderbilt must continue master of the situation, and when the Erie is freed from the incubus which now weighs upon it, it will inevitably pass under his control. Either through geographical necessities or through control of stock, the alliance would, therefore, seem to be inevitable.

Take, for instance, the question of entail. In regard to no point of policy has American law been more jealous than in regard to the creation of perpetuities and the breaking up of large estates. The growth of railroad corporations has entirely baffled all precautions and statute regulations on these points. The railroad system not only constitutes an indefinite number of perpetuities, but they are all perpetuities of indefinite capacity for growth. They are, in fact, private estates in corporate management. The stockholders change, the directors change, the officials change, but the property of the corporation changes only to increase. Thirty years ago there was no corporation in this country of any kind not political, which controlled more than five millions of capital; while that of the largest railroad company was reported at $4,379,225, and the largest gross income of any such company at $427,286. Ten years later, in 1849, the capital of no company exceeded ten millions; but in 1859 the construction account of one was reported at thirty-five millions, and the period of rapid growth had just commenced. The development of the last ten years in this respect has been sufficiently dwelt upon. It is only necessary to add that, at the close of 1869, the Union Pacific claimed to represent over $90,000,000, and the Pacific Central over $75,000,000 of assets, while each kept a mysterious unsubscribed stock capital of over $90,000,000 in the background against future contingencies. Meanwhile, during the same year, one corporation, owning nothing beyond the limits of a single State, reported $104,673,999 of capital stock and indebtedness, on which during the previous year it had earned a gross income of $19,955,518. Such has been the progress in a single generation.

These are individual instances; and all, be it remembered, are but separate members of the huge leviathans which are to be evolved from the changes of the next twenty years. Such as they now are, they constitute a power which knows nothing of laws against perpetuities, or of distribution, which is a law to itself. So far as the influence on government, and on all political questions, is concerned, it makes no difference whether vast accumulated estates are held in the names of individuals or of corporations; those held by individuals are, in

fact, the less dangerous of the two, as, in the natural course of succession, they will inevitably pass into the hands of the incompetent or the improvident. This is not the case with corporations. Their officials and ruling spirits are not born in the purple, nor are they the accidents of accidents; they are, usually, men who force their way up by native ability, and who rule only so long as they succeed. History is not without its precedents of corporate bodies governed in this spirit. One forcible example naturally suggests itself. The Roman Catholic Church was at one time the most enormous landed corporation the world has yet seen, and the most disturbing social and political power. It exercised the combined influence derived from its religious character and its vast, inalienable landed possessions. It would be mere hyperbole to liken the possible future of the railroad system to the past of this famous hierarchy; and yet they are not without their interesting points of resemblance. The railroad system, bound together, as its members in all probability ultimately will be, by a sense of common danger and of common interest, will exercise all that influence which the Roman Church derived from its wealth; though in place of the religious and moral sway of that body it will enjoy only the potent influence conferred upon it by the general passion for material development to which it so efficiently ministers. One advantage which the church enjoyed, and which the railroads can hardly possess, was the concentration of all power at a central point in the hands of a single individual. Hitherto the absence of this concentration has prevented the railroads from obtaining all the control which their wealth and influence would make inevitable should the consolidation of the system ever become perfect. Here lies the political mischief of any proposition which favors what is called State ownership. This subject must be considered in another part of this paper; but it may here be remarked that this concentration, were it ever effected, would, not improbably, result, under our form of government and modes of political action, in giving to the system just that unity and vigor the lack of which has hitherto in great degree neutralized its influence. The railroads of the country, if now brought under a single head or one controlling mind, or the manage-

ment of a single board, would yield all the influence that is involved in the control of $2,000,000,000 of property, returning an annual gross income of $400,000,000, and supporting 450,000 employees. Such a position, in any community which evolves its government through the medium of a caucus, must inevitably become the great political prize, the last spoil of victory. In it the Tammanies of the future might securely entrench themselves, while a hundred Eries hedged them about.

Before entering into any discussion of the phases which the process of consolidation may next assume, and of its possible political effects, it may not be out of place briefly to consider the system, as a disturbing social and political force, even in its present comparatively disconnected and internally discordant condition. The subjects here to be referred to are, however, so far matters of public notoriety that it is unnecessary to state them at great length. Every one has an idea, more or less accurate, of the system of legislative influence and control which the railroads have developed. They are regularly represented by their directors, attorneys, or agents, in every Congress and in each State legislature. Neither is this a fact at all to be regretted, if their action stopped here. The railroad system represents so large a property, and so directly involves in its workings the most delicate interests of our day, that it is both right and desirable that it should be adequately and intelligently represented in every legislative hall. If, therefore, intelligent legislation is a thing to be desired, it is a subject of congratulation rather than of regret that the representatives of railroads are regularly found in the bodies from which legislation proceeds. The difficulty with their political action lies deeper down. Corporations are necessarily selfish. They have their own ends to gain, and exact from the agents they employ the attainment of those ends to the exclusion of all other considerations. Public questions and political and moral discussions are nothing to them; they look simply to the results which their own interests demand, and use the agents who most successfully secure those results, without greatly concerning themselves about the means they employ. One consequence of this has been the growth of a most corrupt system of legislative manipulation and log-rolling. Examples of this

need not be specified; they suggest themselves to every one in the slightest degree conversant with legislation at Washington or in any of the State capitals. Alarming illustrations might be drawn from the recent experience of Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, or Illinois. In some of those States, within the last year, bills of a very diverse character, engineered by corporation counsel, have been combined and balanced one against another in the committee-rooms, and this with scarcely a pretence at concealment; forces were collected, disciplined, and told off, and then the measures were marched into the legislatures in solid column and carried through, almost without a struggle. In New York and Pennsylvania this system has attained its perfect growth. There the great corporations openly ally themselves with political parties and cliques, and are unscrupulously used as engines of party warfare. This has, indeed, been the case for years, though the latest developments are ever the most alarming. The old alliance between the Central road and the Albany regency was deplorable enough, but more recent and closer combinations have proved that the lowest depths of political corruption were not yet sounded.

Such, regarded from a political point of view, is the power and the deteriorating tendency of the system in its present unwieldy and disconnected shape. Each step in the path of concentration apparently strengthens these tendencies. Every phase of consolidation becomes therefore a subject of peculiar interest. If the railroad system is to continue in private hands and under corporate control, will the process stop with the ultimate consolidation of certain connecting lines, now evidently impending; or is this union, even on the largest scale, but one phase of the operation of some general law which will next show itself in a new aspect? This law, be it remembered, is, by name at least, a familiar one: it is the law of gravitation. Just as the larger material body attracts in space the smaller, — just as development naturally leads to a more complex and yet to a more simple condition of being, — so our railroad system tends ever to consolidation, and that consolidation rapidly casts off old trammels, the fruitful source of discord, and results in a more elaborate and perfect organization.

On this subject it is not well to speak too positively, and yet

indications are not wanting that the form of concentration on which we have dwelt is but one, and not the most significant, phase of the working of this general law. It is the one which most effectively and dramatically presents itself to the public, but it is not improbable that a more important revolution is now in rapid progress. Properly to understand the origin and possible scope of this movement, a retrospect is necessary.

What is known as the express system of America is a very peculiar and convenient, though expensive organization, wholly the creation of this country and of the present generation. The men who have since given their names to immense companies, wielding millions of capital, began their brilliant careers in a very modest way. To the Harndens belongs the credit of originating the business. They began operations in 1839, passing to and fro between Boston and New York, carpet-bag in hand; but that carpet-bag was big with the express system of America. At first they undertook little more than to carry money, letters, and valuables, to make collections, and to see to the delivery of very small parcels between the two cities; but the carpet-bag soon expanded into a trunk; the trunk developed into a crate, and each new crate contained more and more cubic feet, until at last they became freight-cars, and the managers grasped at the internal carrying trade. For several years the receipts of the route between Boston and New York hardly exceeded fifty dollars a day, out of which fares, salaries, office-rent, wages, and costs of delivery had to be paid. The machinery, however, was needed; new lines were organized, opposition started up, and, when Harnden died, in 1845, only thirty-three years old, the business was practically as fully developed as it is to-day. In 1868 there were over 3,000 licensed express carriers and agents in the country, paying an Internal Revenue tax on more than $22,000,000 of gross receipts. Even as early as 1845 the organization had brought about a division of the carriage of freight. The most valuable and remunerative part of it, the carrying of all small and valuable packages, which demand little room and pay heavy rates, had passed out of the hands of the railroads into those of the express companies. These in fact became enormous parasites on the railway system, tak-

ing from it the most profitable part of the freighting business. Their capital and elaborate machinery was nothing more nor less than so many millions added to that sum on which the transportation of the country was called upon to pay dividends. This capital, too, unlike the capital invested in railroads, was subject to no public supervision, and could be indefinitely increased. It has been increased accordingly, through a systematic process of "watering," until, at the present time, the stock of four of the leading companies amounts to $50,000,000, of which probably not $15,000,000 has ever been paid in or is represented by assets. This immense sum is in reality simply that amount on which the directors of the companies believe that they can pay a fair interest from their profits. These profits are in great degree earned out of the railroads, and the community pays on everything sent by the expresses a double charge, — first, a charge to the railroads which perform the transportation; and secondly, one to the agency with whom the contract is directly entered into. At one time this expensive system seemed likely to monopolize, by means of its despatch lines, the whole business of "time freights," and to draw to itself the carriage of all articles, no matter how bulky, on which persons were willing to pay the price necessary to insure speedy delivery. The wealth of the companies was so great, and their influence ramified so far, that the management of railroads in a great degree passed under their control. Officers of the latter corporations suddenly found themselves considerable holders of express stocks, or openly received bribes. The result was that some of these officials observed with indifference, or even connived at, the great inroads which the express system was making on the legitimate freighting business of their lines. There had, however, always been a portion of the railroad managers who had resisted these encroachments, and who had insisted that the railroads ought to conduct the express business, both in their own interest and in that of the community. Nothing, however, was practically done to check the rapid growth of the express companies, until the system of "time freights" was inaugurated by the railroads themselves, in 1858. This was the first step taken by them towards the resumption of their legitimate business, and this was forced upon the

roads by the strenuous exertions of business men. The system of time freights once inaugurated, the attention of railroad managers was soon aroused to the possible profits to be derived from its development. Naturally, this development took the form of a job. Certain men, controlling great through lines, conceived the idea of forming a company which should be nothing more than an immense freight express line, owning its own cars and charging its own prices, while the railroads were to supply only road-beds and motive-power, and charge tolls for drawing cars over their lines. The system of moving freights by canal, in accordance with which all the original railroad charters were drawn, was in fact revived and applied to railroads. This scheme promised to carry to the last possible point of development the express system. The business of carrying freights in their own interest was to be surrendered by the railroad companies, who were henceforth to devote themselves to the transportation of passengers and the dragging of freight-cars. If properly instituted, and regulated with thorough impartiality, with a view to a perfectly free competition between firms engaged in the shipping business, such a system would not be without its advantages. It would create a division of labor, and, if favoritism were excluded, would tend to stimulate competition. It was, however, brought forward with no such views. The men who devised it controlled the roads over which it was to be put in operation. Competition was the last thing they had in view; on the contrary, they proposed to monopolize in their private hands the whole lucrative business of time freights. It was an immense job. The credit of defeating this ingenious plan belongs, it is said, to the president of a leading New England road. His concurrence in the enterprise was essential to its success; but, when the plan was submitted to him, he refused to have anything to do with it, except in his official capacity and in the interest of his road. He saw at once the great importance of the scheme, and how profitable it might be made, but he insisted that the roads, and not individuals, should be the parties to it, and that to them all the profits should accrue. This action on his part ultimately led to the formation of the earliest of what are known as the "colored lines." It was organized in 1865, and was substan-

tially a corporation within a corporation. Certain contracting roads between the West and tide-water established the line, all the cars of which were to be numbered, and distinguished by a uniform color. These were to transport freights, under special conditions, from any point of reception to any point of delivery on the connecting roads. Each road was to contribute a quota of cars in proportion to its mileage and traffic. The machinery for the collection and disbursement of money was very ingenious and very simple. A clearing-house, of course, had to be established. The duties of this were, however, confined to the keeping of a record of the miles run by the cars of the various roads in the combination, and to striking, accordingly, a balance of credit or debit each month. A small percentage on the capital invested was then charged for wear and tear, and a balance-sheet forwarded to each road. All transactions in regard to freights are settled in cash when they take place, and no receipts are returned to the clearing-house. A business involving millions each month may thus be done on the payment of only trifling sums in the way of balances. The growth of this system is one of the marvels of railroad development. The "Blue Line" alone has published a report of its doings, and that only for the first year of its organization. During that time, however, it moved 147,052 tons of freight, and earned $2,692,615, employing 733 cars in the first half-year and 814 in the second, and moving 137,588,819 tons one mile. By the end of the year 1868, of which year no report has been published, the number of cars in the line is stated to have increased to over 1,400, and the movement of freight to nearly 240,000 tons, or 217,333,764 moved one mile. For the first six months of 1869 the number of cars was over 1,800, and the tons moved more than in the entire year 1867, — amounting to 151,995,257 moved one mile. The tonnage of the White Line increased from 57,084,018 tons moved one mile during the first six months of its organization, in 1866–7, by regular gradation, up to 189,249,391 during six months of 1869. The Red Line during the first six months of its operations, in 1865–6, had in service an average number of 321 cars, which ran 3,204,433 miles, and, during six months of 1869, an average number of 649 cars, which ran 10,649,064 miles. The

number of tons moved one mile during the latter period was 191,845,757, against 52,359,571 during the former.

There are three peculiarly significant features in the history of these organizations, — the creation of corporations within corporations, the establishment of a clearing-house, and the rapid growth of the system. It is not impossible that these innovations may result in a revolution of the freighting business, perhaps of the railroad system. The essential feature of the organization is the combining of roads, whether competing or connecting, through the machinery of a clearing-house. This once established, the extent of its possible development cannot be forecast. If a corporation within a corporation, including, as it easily might, a central tribunal practically empowered to enforce its own judgments, should gradually be developed out of this beginning, it is more than probable that the days of railroad competition would be numbered. The present time-freight lines may, therefore, contain the germ of that consolidation which shall weld the railroad interests together as one body, and give to them the unity and concentration which hitherto they have notoriously lacked. This result of the experiment of 1865 would seem by no means so unlikely as that from one carpet-bag in 1838 should spring the present express system of America.

Neither would the result suggested as possible prove, perhaps, in itself, and materially considered, so grave an evil as is commonly imagined. Hitherto competition has been the bane of railways; and, indeed, it is a question whether it has not done more harm than good to the business community which has relied upon it as a protection against monopoly. No system can work its way out to logical results which is perpetually subject to fluctuations; and competition has ever acted on the railway system as a violent disturbing element. At one time it has forced down the charges on transportation to an unnaturally low rate, only to elevate them at another time by artificial combinations to a rate as unnecessarily excessive. Within the last year freights between New York and Chicago have fluctuated, under this influence, between $5 and $37.60 per ton; and between the same point and St. Louis, between $7 and $46; while, within the last three years, the Erie Railway has carried

goods to Chicago at as low a rate as $2 per ton, and from this bounded back to $37. In the last case, part of the transportation was by water; but rates on the same class of freights carried through by rail have ranged all the way from four mills to four cents per ton per mile, and fluctuated violently from the one point to the other. Such has been the result of competition as regards through business, while upon local business its effect has been even more pernicious. "Usually, competing lines, while they seek the same large centres of commerce, reach them through different districts. This confines their competition to the trade of such centres, while the traffic of the country peculiar to each line is not only uncompeted for, but subjected to an extra and often oppressive tax, whereby to restore the revenue depletions each road suffers in its violent struggles with the others for jointly accessible business. The ability to unjustly burden uncompetitive or local trade supplies transporters with strength to wage prolonged contests for other tonnage at less than cost of transport; and this wretched warfare, indirectly ruinous to the local business it overtaxes, is of little real benefit to the property battled for; as, sooner or later, truce is declared, and, if the truce becomes a permanent peace, competition ceases; while if but a temporary measure, it is presently broken, but only to be renewed; then renewed, but only to be broken; while the tax on trade fluctuates with the shattering or maintenance of covenants, until commerce is harassed and dazed and partially prostrated by its wild, illogical, and ruinous changes." *

For these reasons competition has long been regarded among the best authorities on railroads as a dangerous evil. George Stephenson, the shrewdest man that ever devoted himself to the subject, so regarded it from the beginning, and condensed his reasoning on the subject into the aphorism that, "Where combination is possible, competition is impossible." The most sagacious railway managers look upon it as a terrible weapon in the hands of the visionary, the reckless, or the ignorant; an almost insuperable obstacle in the way of the judicious, the conservative, and the progressive. It disturbs every calculation,

* "Transportation as a Science." A paper read by Jos. D. Potts, President of the Empire Transportation Co., before the American Social Science Association at a meeting in New York, October 28, 1869.

vitiates every result, puts a stop to all experiment, destroys all system. All persons concerned in the management of railways are therefore anxious to get rid of it,—the more respectable, that the railway system may have a chance to work out its results under a settled policy; the unscrupulous and less reputable, that a better occasion for levying plunder may be afforded. Under these circumstances it is not impossible that all may unite in the adoption of the principle now lying at the basis of the "colored lines," — that of a combination and a clearing-house for the adjustment of difficulties, — as a solution of the question.* Should the seed sown in 1865, which has so rapidly developed within these few years, have this result within the next thirty, there will then exist a combination of forces, material, social, and political, united under one head, which may bear a comparison even with the Church of Rome.

Such a combination would, of course, at once put a stop to competition in so far as the land carriage of freight is concerned. Railroads would, indeed, continue to compete with

---

* The following extract from a communication printed in the New York "Tribune" of November 22, 1869, is not wholly without significance as an indication of the drift of opinion in this direction: —

"*To the Editor of the Tribune.*

"Sir, — Will you allow us, through the wide circulation of your paper, to present to the stockholders of the great railway system of the United States a practical plan to realize a dividend of six per cent on the capital invested. To do this, the whole system must be reorganized on a common-sense basis, with one president to supervise the whole, with as many sub-presidents or assistants as there are now presidents of all the links that go to make up the great network of railways that cover the face of every State. These different reticulation of railways are as mutually dependent on each other for success as one member of a man's body is dependent on another. The whole railroad system is dependent for success on the commercial circulation of the inhabitants of one section of the country with another.

"Therefore, to make the institution a paying one, we must have good management, good roads, and a fair remuneration for the work done. The system as now conducted is very much like an army without a general in the field, with each brigadier taking care of 'number one.'

. . . . . .

"If the people and the public generally are the bone of any country, we think the stockholders and the railroads are the muscle and sinew. Therefore we think the first step to this great reform would be to call a national convention at New York of the stockholders, directors, and presidents, to elect one national president and treasurer to financier the whole. Yours, respectfully,

"Tom Benton Smith,
"*Agent R. R. S.*"

all water routes, but no longer with each other. It is absurd to suppose that, after the creation of such a central power, the force necessary to make its decisions effective would be wanting. No single member, however powerful, of a combination of the sort suggested, could afford to rebel, when the immediate result of so doing would be that it would be thrown out of the clearing-house and its connections cut. It would, in short, be placed in a position precisely similar to that of a New England bank which, a few years ago, should have refused to conform to the regulations of the Suffolk Bank system. A railroad in conflict with the combination would at once be disabled from transacting any business, except that on its own line and distinct from the railroad system; it would be shut up to starve within its own territory; and the business which should have passed over it would pass round it, over other roads, built to insure competition, but equally available for the purpose of crushing it. The express system has already furnished examples of the exercise of this power. Only recently the Erie Railway undertook to impose certain unsatisfactory terms on the United States Express Company. The express company, thereupon, prepared to direct the vast freight which it moves over competing lines. The managers of the road, reckless as they are, preferred, on reflection, to avoid the conflict, and did not insist on their point.

Neither will it be possible to meet by legislation such a contingency as that suggested. Congress or State legislatures may, indeed, enact by statute that connecting roads shall receive freights from or deliver them to any recusant line; but here their power stops. They cannot by any law, no matter how stringent or cunningly devised, control the direction which may be given by any combination to the immense mass of freight which merely seeks a transit from one part of the continent to another; neither can they dictate as to the use of rolling-stock, which includes the vital point of breaking bulk. Both of these matters obey a law of their own, and merchandise once passing under the control and into the cars of a combination, will, of necessity, follow the channel into which it is directed. No relief could be found from this quarter, even supposing that a combination wielding the immense political

influence which would be possessed by that suggested could not regulate legislation to suit itself.

The first steps then towards combination were taken by the railroads in a species of antagonism to the express companies; they resorted to them for the purpose of self-defence. It now remains for them to follow up their victory, and finally to extend the principle on which they achieved it to the working of their own system. The conflict with the express companies is not yet over. The expediency of the railroads forcing it to an issue by assuming the express business has more than once of late been gravely considered by those who control great connecting lines. The decision has in fact rested with one man. Some time ago this course was urged upon Commodore Vanderbilt, who excused himself from it on the ground that he was too old to go into such a conflict. Had he decided otherwise, had his roads and their connections — and these last were ripe for the measure — decided to cancel all their contracts with the express companies and to assume the whole freighting business, in all its departments, throughout their combined territory, the general combination which has been described must, apparently, have followed. It would have followed whether originally contemplated or not, as the roads could hardly have transacted this business in competition with a powerful and concentrated organization, without the assistance of a machinery equally effective. They could not receive and receipt for parcels and valuable packages, bonds, currency, and specie, to be delivered to consignees in any part of the country, and for the delivery of which they were responsible, without the intervention of a clearing-house, and of a central tribunal to regulate and enforce liability among themselves; they must have resorted to a corporation within a corporation. This once done and extended beyond connecting lines, the whole machinery of consolidation, in so far as freights are concerned, would be practically effected. The central tribunal is established, and the process of development will assert itself. It will be well, therefore, for those who are calling upon the railroads to assume the express business, and to destroy the express companies, to consider maturely the full consequences of their recommendation. These companies are indeed parasites on

the railway system; they do indeed draw from it the most desirable part of the freighting business; they are, as is alleged, wholly free from supervision, and do impose a heavy and to a great extent unnecessary tax on the community; but if the railroads in this country assume the functions of the express companies, they must also assume their organization, and it may well be questioned whether the public would contemplate such a combination with equanimity. It is by no means impossible that very beneficial results might flow from it; is it not also possible that the race of Frankensteins is not yet extinct?

There are other considerations, however, apart from their conflict with the express companies and a legitimate desire to suppress competition, which impel the railway managers towards combination. Another and very peculiar phase of railroad development remains to be considered. The subject of railroad inflation, as it was then styled, but which is more commonly known as "stock-watering," was discussed a year ago in the pages of this Review. The possible force of this evil practice upon the minds of all stockholders or railroad managers who care anything for dividends, as an argument in support of a combination of roads, is very apparent. As the volume of stock is increased, larger sums must be earned to keep up dividends upon it, and how those sums are to be extorted from the public becomes a question ever more difficult of solution. As yet the evil has not passed beyond control, and the legitimate profits under the old system meet present requirements, in spite of competition, and notwithstanding the immense amount of fictitious capital on which dividends are demanded. At the rate at which the evil is progressing, however, this will not long be the case; and, at no remote time, it may suggest itself to the persons most interested, that combination is an excellent method of levying tolls. Whenever that time comes, if all the necessary machinery presents itself constructed and ready for application, so tempting an opportunity will hardly remain unimproved.

The practice of stock-watering received a great impetus during the year 1869. Fallacious arguments were, of course, not wanting in support of it. Commodore Vanderbilt led

off, in December, 1868, by a vast addition to the paper capital of the New York Central, representing, as he claimed, the profits of previous years, which would properly have gone to dividends, but had been absorbed in constructing and equipping the road, which accordingly possessed a real value by no means represented by the amount of its stock in existence. This increase was represented as eighty-four per cent of the whole capital, and that amount was accordingly issued as an extra stock dividend. This was done in the face of repeated sworn statements, on the part of the direction of the road, in previous years, that it could not earn six-per-cent dividends on the existing capital, and that the whole amount which had passed into improved construction did not much exceed $6,000,000.

The law of New York, under which the New York Central was operated, constituted a contract equally binding on the owners of the road and on the community. This law, under certain of its provisions, gave to the Central a valuable franchise and a practical monopoly of a lucrative business. This was what the corporators received. In return for it they undertook to build and operate a road under certain conditions, one of which was that "the Legislature may . . . . from time to time alter or reduce the rate of freight, fare, or other profits upon such road; but the same shall not, without the consent of the corporation, be so reduced as to produce with said profits less than ten per centum per annum on the property actually expended." * This limitation, wise or foolish, could have been imposed by one of the parties and accepted by the other, but with a single end in view, — to prevent the levying of onerous taxes on the traffic of a public highway in order to pay exorbitant interest on the private capital invested in its construction. A high rate of interest was fixed, to induce persons to incur the risk of loss; had the State guaranteed the capital invested, six per cent instead of ten would have been sufficient inducement. The business of the road thus stood charged with a possible annuity of ten per cent in perpetuity to its nominal owners on the money actually expended in it by them, and they retained its management. The corporation would

* Acts of New York, 1850, ch. 140, § 33.

never have dreamed, in the face of this provision in its organic law, of dividing to its stockholders twenty per cent a year on the original capital paid in. It did assert, however, — and railroad managers as a class all over the country have asserted, in the face of similar laws, and made themselves and the public actually believe, — that, though they could not divide on their stock more than the percentage specified in the contract, they yet could divide that percentage on any amount of stock they chose to create. In other words, they could not divide more than ten per cent on the hundred dollars they had paid in, but they could call that hundred dollars four hundred, and levy and divide ten per cent on the whole amount. The truth was and is, that the contract was one not fit to be made ; but yet it was made, and was and is in force. It only remains to see how it has been carried out. The gradual inflation of the three roads, — the Harlem, Hudson River, and Central, commonly known as the Vanderbilt roads, — up to a little more than a year ago, was referred to in the pages of this Review for January, 1869. The rumors of the brilliant move then supposed to be impending, and which was to eclipse all previous efforts in railroad financiering, were vaguely alluded to, with a remark that "such a climax of paper capital may yet be in store for us, as the last sinful absurdity of an era of paper money." The reality has surpassed expectation. The private "capital actually expended" in the Central and Hudson River Railroads may, at a liberal estimate, amount to $40,000,000. In 1862 these roads returned $52,370,431 of stock capital and bonded indebtedness, and $61,914,928 in 1868. At the close of 1869 they are represented by $45,000,000 of share capital and $59,853,299 of indebtedness; while the evidences of these values, amounting to $104,853,299, have all passed into the private hands which advanced the original $40,000,000. It is further confidently stated that the business of New York, New England, and the West can be made to pay $8,000,000 per annum on this nominal capital, or twenty per cent a year on the "capital actually expended."

Under the influence of these ingenious feats of legerdemain, the railroad system has now definitely passed into the phase of extreme paper inflation, and the last hope has vanished of

arriving, by any regular process, at an ideal system which, while adequately remunerating the nominal owners of roads, would impose the smallest possible transportation tax on every description of traffic. The present condition and future prospects of the existing system may not improperly be compared to those of some community which has entered upon the dangerous career of making paper money a legal tender. Each fresh emission may not immediately make itself felt; but enough of them must, in the end, destroy all values, and enough of them to do this will almost inevitably be forthcoming. How soon this result will be arrived at in the experience of railways cannot now be predicted, but the year 1869 made a great advance towards it. During the "gold-corner" panic of September, a prominent Wall Street operator tersely remarked that railroad stocks had been watered so much that "the original security was almost washed away."

Other railroad managers have not been slow to imitate, though on a reduced scale, the splendid example set them by Commodore Vanderbilt. The proceedings of the Erie depredators have already been described in the pages of this Review.* Their operations were not even covered with a decent veil of sophistry, but degenerated into downright fraud upon both their stockholders and the public. Their antics, no less than Vanderbilt's operations, happily illustrate the need which exists for some agency constantly to represent the community in all the complications which arise out of the existence of a modern railroad system. At present there is no one in New York whose especial duty it is to watch over the interests of the public. What is the business of every one is the business of no one, and those interests are now left to protect themselves. A few years ago there was a tribunal in New York created for this purpose, and clothed with adequate powers; its supervision was, however, disagreeable to the railway potentates, and it was, accordingly, lobbied out of existence. Had this tribunal still existed, and had the officials composing it done their duty during the last two years, the public could hardly have suffered as they have under the depredations of the marauders. Every engine of the law would have been set in motion, — the

* North American Review, July, 1869, pp. 30–106.

Attorney-General and the courts would have been stimulated to action, the Executive and the legislature would have been appealed to, and all possible measures taken, to thwart and crush the unlawful and outrageous proceedings of the Erie gang. Vanderbilt's operations also would have been enjoined, and the public outside of Wall Street enlightened as to its rights and the bearing of his action. As to those directors who have outraged law, equity, public opinion, and common decency in betraying every obligation of trustee and guardian, if statutes now in force could not place them where of right they belong, — within the four walls of a prison, — then such as would accomplish that result should at least have been recommended, for the benefit of all who might seek to imitate their example. No such guardians of the public welfare were provided, and, in their absence, the stock of the Erie Railway was secretly and fraudulently increased, in the short period of twenty months, from $16,574,300 to $70,000,000, that is, by an addition of three hundred and twenty-two per cent of mere "water." Either precedent or imitation of such a proceeding is, happily, as yet sought for in vain; but the president of the corporation capped the climax of his outrages by stating to a legislative committee, with inexpressible impudence, that the stock of the road he had plundered no longer possessed any value except for "speculative purposes."

After dealing with such vast sums and contemplating such unprecedented "irregularities," it is almost uninteresting to revert to the commonplace cases of inflation. These, however, though individually insignificant when compared with Central or Erie, amounting perhaps in no single instance during the last year to more than a trifling six or eight millions, yet in the aggregate are considerable. The Fort Wayne, for instance, took advantage of a permanent lease to increase its stock capital from $11,500,000 to $19,550,000, preferring, naturally, seven per cent on the larger sum to twelve per cent on the smaller. This is the road towards the construction and equipment of which the stockholders are said to have actually paid in about $4,000,000. Well might a leading Western newspaper exclaim, in contemplation of such proceedings: "To obtain dividends on this aggregated capital, and pay interest

on the bonded debt, will require a continuance of the system of carrying freight at a loss in all cases where there is competition, and resorting to wholesale extortion where there is no competition!" A dispute resulting in litigation takes place between two opposing interests; in due time it is announced through the press that the difficulty has been arranged "on the following terms: first, all suits are to be withdrawn; second, one million of new stock is to be issued, which is to be equally divided between the parties in the recent controversy." A raid is made by the Erie thieves on the Susquehanna Road, and this road is hustled into a New York court, there to be plundered; in a few days the parties to the conflict are found to be considering a settlement based on a ninety-nine years' lease and a thirty-per-cent stock dividend. *Quidquid delirant reges, plectuntur Achivi.*

The Michigan Central divides ten per cent in stock, and the Cincinnati, Hamilton, and Dayton five per cent; the Cleveland and Pittsburg divides fifteen per cent, and the East Pennsylvania is leased to the Reading, and, as a part of the transaction, doubles its whole stock capital.

It is useless to multiply instances; and one more, while it sufficiently illustrates the past, may also foreshadow the future. It would be strange indeed if a year were to elapse in which the Cleveland, Painesville, and Ashtabula road did not appear before the public in this connection. This is the famous line which, having cost in money $4,868,427, divided three hundred and nineteen per cent in seven years, and, in 1868, was paying dividends or interest on $11,250,000 of stock and bonded indebtedness. The consolidated Michigan, Southern, and Lake Shore line, of which this road now forms a part, operates 856 miles of track, which certainly does not represent $35,000,000 of private capital expended in construction. A year ago the several roads since merged returned an aggregate of $51,548,830 of stock and bonded indebtedness. The consolidated line returns $55,000,000. Great moderation has been evinced here; three and a half millions, or even twenty millions, does no justice to the occasion. The end, however, is not yet. The Lake Shore and Michigan Southern is intersected by another line, known as the Toledo, Wabash, and Western; the latter,

a road not yet wholly finished, is destined to merge with the former, making a great consolidation of about 1,500 miles in length. Twice within the last year has a basis of union been agreed upon by the representatives of the two roads. The terms of the first agreement provided for $6,000,000 of "water" as the amount which it was thought the business of the country would endure. This arrangement was not carried out, and a new one was effected, with the six millions of "water" left out. Meanwhile, before this agreement could be ratified, Commodore Vanderbilt had obtained a controlling influence in the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern. New and unforeseen difficulties at once arose in quarters where they would least have been expected, and the proposed consolidation fell through. Possibly, Mr. Vanderbilt may not have considered the Toledo, Wabash, and Western sufficiently depreciated in Wall Street to induce him, as yet, to absorb it. The present market price of that stock is slightly over fifty per cent of its par value. Should it, during any monetary pressure, be forced heavily on the market at low prices, it may then be presumed that the process of absorption is begun. Mr. Vanderbilt never does things by halves: as depreciation will, in due time, be succeeded by inflation, so consolidation will follow absorption. The terms on which this will then be effected might afford food for curious speculation. If consolidated on the basis of present stock capital and indebtedness, the resulting road would be represented by a little less than $52,000 of securities to the mile. In 1866 the present Vanderbilt roads of New York were represented by a little less than $60,000 per mile, which has since been converted into rather more than $115,000 per mile. The same modest ratio of increased valuation, applied at the proper time to these Western connections of the Vanderbilt roads, will convert their present $77,500,000 (which in itself ought to be at most not more than $60,000,000) into a round $150,000,000, which will be in thorough sympathy with the enlarged spirit of the times. This road will then complete the great "watered" line connecting the cities of New York and Boston with Chicago and St. Louis.

So far as the process of Vanderbilt absorption and consolidation, in this direction, has yet gone, the result may be stated

as follows: The distance from New York to Chicago is 988 miles, but the roads dividing this distance operate, in main, branch, and lateral lines, 1705 miles. The average cost of constructing railroads, in the region through which they operate, is $44,000 per mile, which would have made the cost of this through line $75,000,000; upon which a reasonable interest would be paid by levying on traffic a tax of $6,000,000 per annum. In place of this, however, these same roads, under the exhilarating influence of "water," report already a cost of $160,000,000, or $94,000 to the mile, upon which they actually exact from the public over $12,000,000 in excess of all operating expenses. In other words, an annual "water-tax" is levied of over $6,000,000. As already intimated, the work would now seem to be half done. If, in this case, the foot reveals the Hercules, the capital of the complete consolidated line may be fixed at $250,000,000 (real cost, perhaps, $100,000,000 in private capital), for which an annual levy, on traffic, of $20,000,000 will be demanded, as of right.

There are no complete and reliable statistics on this subject of "watering"; indeed, the process is, as a rule, so ingeniously covered up in public statements that it is very difficult to detect it in individual cases. Grand results, however, make themselves apparent. A table was published, during the last year, in a leading financial organ,* comparing the capital stocks of twenty-eight roads as they stood on July 1, 1867, and May 1, 1869. During those twenty-two months it was found that the total had increased from $287,036,000 to $400,684,000, or forty per cent. Carrying the comparison on nine of these roads back two years farther, it was found that, in less than four years, their capitals had increased from less than $84,000,000 to over $208,000,000, or 150 per cent. This table does not include the last 85 per cent on Hudson River, or 27 per cent on New York Central, or 71 per cent on Fort Wayne, or 100 per cent on East Pennsylvania, or 25 per cent on New Haven, or the 10 per cent on Toledo and Wabash, or the 15 per cent on Cleveland and Pittsburg, or the proffered 30 per cent on Albany and Susquehanna, or the last

* The Commercial and Financial Chronicle of May 15, 1869.

score or two of millions of Erie. A portion of this, perhaps 25 per cent of the whole, represents private capital actually paid in and expended; another portion, perhaps equally large, represents dividends the payment of which was foregone and the money applied to construction; the whole of the remainder may be set down as pure, unadulterated "water," which calls for an annual tax-levy of some eight or ten millions a year. Nearly twenty years ago Bastiat asserted that every one was "seeking in sincerity and ardor the solution of this problem, — *to bring the price of things in their place of consumption as near as possible to their price in that of production.*" Either the railroad companies constitute an exception to this general rule, or their method of procedure has not yet been fully explained.

The ultimate result to which this practice must lead, if persevered in, is not now to be considered. Meanwhile, before that end is attained, and the great mass of our railways are reduced to the present condition of Erie, — their stock being on the street, and useful only for "speculative purposes," — before a final reconstruction of the relations between the railways and the community becomes a necessity, the whole energies of railroad managers must be directed to the increase of net earnings. To this end the public must be plundered where no competition exists, and the roads plundered where it does; rolling-stock and road-beds will be worn out, and the lives of the community jeoparded by cheap iron and single tracks; gamblers will gain possession of our roads, and the manipulation of stock will be considered the essence of railroad management. Impelled by this necessity of their own creation, a strong inducement is held out to the members of the system to reverse their tactics; as hitherto they have competed to their own loss, in future they may combine to the loss of the public. It is true that the machinery for doing this is almost necessarily confined to freights; but few persons, who do not make a study of railroad questions, at all realize what a controlling element in the business and profits of railroads is included under the heading of "freights." The growth of this branch of the business of railways, both here and in Europe, has been such that the mind with difficulty grasps the figures which express it. During the last year the freight

transported on the roads of the United States was 75,000,000 tons, valued at $10,472,250,000. This movement dates almost wholly from the year 1851, when the railway freight of this country did not probably exceed a fifteenth part of what it now is, nor even as late as 1858 did it exceed eighteen millions of tons. The increase has mainly been the work of the last decade. In 1851 the freight business and the passenger business were of nearly equal value to the railroad system, returning that year about $20,000,000 each; during the year 1868 the ratio of freight earnings to passenger earnings was as two and a half to one, or $280,000,000 to $120,000,000.* Those who can may grasp the significance of those figures; they are introduced here simply to illustrate the magnitude of that branch of their business which the roads may at any time take out of the field of competition. The inducement to do so is sufficiently great; the machinery required is already in existence and partially developed; the organizing and combining mind alone is wanting; and, not impossibly, the sharp dividend exigencies of watered stock may, at no remote period, call it into existence. Should this take place, new problems, social, political, and economical, will force themselves on the community for solution.

There are those, doubtless, who will incline to the opinion that in such a contingency the simple alternative will be presented to the community between the ownership of the railroads by the State and the ownership of the State by railroads. Unfortunately neither alternative disposes of the difficulty. This is no trifling matter, to be dogmatically settled or lightly experimented upon, but a decision of it involves far-reaching social and political consequences which the most sagacious cannot fathom. Take, for instance, the conception of the ownership of railroads by the State, — the Belgian system, as it is called, — towards the adoption of which Great Britain seems now tending, and which is not without advocates in this country. Suppose the conflict with the corporate railroad system to be over, and the railroads to be purchased and transferred to the State, to be thereafter operated by the community,

* Manual of Railways of United States, 1868–9, H. V. Poor, pp. xli.–xliii.

in its own interest, as the post-office is managed by it at present. What result would such an innovation and precedent have upon our political system? It is wholly futile to suppose, in the face of the growing tendency to nationality, the constantly increasing disposition to ignore State lines and to transfer control to the general government, that this revolution would confine itself to State limits, or that a dozen different organizations would control a Pacific railway. Such a system, with local jealousies, interests, and pride to contend with, — each great line running the gauntlet of a dozen rival competing points, and artificially turned into twenty interested channels, — would so hamper the commerce of the continent that it would crumble into chaos in less than a twelvemonth. Government ownership of railroads can therefore with us only mean their ultimate ownership by the national government. It may not at first thus present itself, but to this favor must it come. The fundamental principle of our political system, particularly the national system, is non-interference. It originated in a protest against the doctrine, once, on this continent at least, supposed to be antiquated, that that government was best which governed most. Our whole political organization, our history as a nation, the prodigious material development of which we are so vain, — all of these rest on the great principle of limited governmental functions, and the leaving of persons and interests to rely on themselves and to work out their own destiny in their own way, subject to the least possible external interference. To turn over to a government constructed on such a principle the management of so complex an organization as the railroad system would be like planting an oak-tree in a porcelain vase. It is unnecessary to maintain that our political system is the best; perhaps, after all, we were wrong, and the French, or the Belgian, or the Russian system is better than ours. It is not necessary to decide this question. The point simply is, that unless a total change, social and political, is contemplated, it is not wise to enter upon that course which must inevitably result in such a change. If the people of this country want a strong, compact, all-regulating, and all-providing central government, it is at any time in their power to have it; but it is much to be hoped that they will not fall

into the lamentable error of thrusting the functions of an autocrat on the machinery of a commonwealth. Of late they have shown some inclination to do so; should the same tendency undergo a further and rapid development, — should one innovation be made a precedent for another, — it is not impossible that another generation may behold the beautiful system which once sought jealously to confine itself to the simplest functions, staggering along in a clumsy endeavor to do that which those whom it thought to forever displace could do many times as well. Revolutions never stand still. If our fundamental principle is to be violated, and the government become a common carrier to please one class of reformers, it will soon become a banker to please another, an expressman to gratify a third, and a telegraph-operator to supplement its other duties as postman. The feudal system having yielded to the monarchical, and that in turn to the republican, the next phase would seem to be the co-operative trades-union.

Meanwhile, here are two systems growing and expanding side by side, — the representative republican system of government, adapted to a simple and somewhat undeveloped phase of society; and the corporate industrial system, the result and concomitant of a complex and artificial civilization. How long can they develop together? The peculiarities and combinations now noticed in our legislatures and market-places, the growing torpidity of public opinion, the constant strain under which our machinery of government visibly works, the crude, undigested propositions for reform which emanate from every quarter, the startling rapidity with which change develops itself, and the rapidly shifting phases which all interests assume, clearly indicate some deep-seated social and political revolution now in progress. What this will result in, time only can disclose. It would be a mere waste of space and ingenuity to endeavor to forecast it at present. One thing is, however, daily becoming more evident, and as a result may, according to present indications, soon be classed among the things that are inevitable. Our political system cannot much longer sustain the conflict with corporations. Modern civilization has created a class of powers which are too strong for the control of our governments. The machinery of com-

bination and perpetuity is too perfect. The future in this matter is in some degree foreshadowed by the past. Once already has a great corporate interest grasped at the control of our government, and it could only be thrown off by the convulsion of a civil war. On one other occasion the government became involved in a conflict with a private corporation, wielding the power of only $35,000,000 of capital, and for years the country was disturbed. Both of these were the episodes of earlier and simpler days. What is the aspect of the present? The States of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Maryland are respectively owned by corporations within their limits. New York is governed by two corporations, acting in concert with one corrupt political ring. The United States is struggling painfully with half a dozen great combinations of private and corporate interests, and no well-informed man doubts that to-day it is in the power of the national banking system alone to dictate to the national government any financial policy it may desire, and to compel its adoption. The simple fact is, that on the people, who with us are the source of all power, these combinations, through their material influence and their power to create or allay disturbance, exercise more control than officials and reformers combined. How indeed could it be otherwise? Compare the things of to-day with those of yesterday. The United States Bank, in the days of its greatest pride, boasted a capital of $35,000,000. The slave power was welded together by nine hundred millions of property, but controlled only one section of the country and could be combated in another. The bank was overthrown through its own folly, after a nine years' struggle; the destruction of slavery was accomplished after twenty-five years of agitation and four years of civil war. The present banking system consists of one compact organization, sensitive to the common interest, subject to a common control, which now enjoys $426,000,000 of wealth, and $50,000,000 of income, and is distributed all over the country. The railroad system dwarfs even this. Single members of it control two hundred millions of capital and employ tens of thousands of men. As a united influence it shoots out its ramifications into every State and county and town of the whole Union, and represents and wields all the power contained in

$2,000,000,000 of wealth. These are the disturbing forces now called upon to take part in a social system which grew up under a government created in 1789. What will be the limits of their action? May not the oak-tree already be shattering the porcelain vase? These powers and influences, be it remembered, do not violently overthrow, but rather quietly antiquate, any system of government which thwarts their development. In our case they will prove a disturbing, and probably, under the present system of government, an uncontrollable, force just so long as their development is a subject of legislation, and so long as the community seeks to impose legal restraints upon them, or they have ends to gain with legislative bodies. To these there will be no end. The real danger lies in the sad fact that in the conflict the government has not an equal chance. The corporations are always in earnest; the officials rarely are. Above all, the corporation does not change. Its whole organization aims at unity in council, persistency in action, and the selection from the community of the highest order of that ability which it needs, and which, once found, it permanently retains in power: it is a disciplined, organized army. This superb, effective organism, the last development of modern civilization, is then placed in subordination to, or brought into conflict with, a political administration which originates in the caucus, is continually trembling for its retention in the temporary power which it received on the principle of rotation in office, and which it signalizes by a new illustration of the maxim that to the victors belong the spoils. In conflict with such a system it needs no prophet to foresee that, in the future, as in the past, the spoils will, as a rule, belong to the corporations.

Charles F. Adams, Jr.

Art. V. — The Ecclesiastical Crisis in England.

Will the disestablishment of the Church in Ireland be followed by the disestablishment of the Church in England? This is a question often asked of Englishmen by Americans who take an interest in English politics. The answer must be, that England moves; — she has moved now, pretty steadily and without taking a single step backwards, for nearly two hundred years; — but that she moves slowly, though at this moment, no doubt, owing to the desertion, by the Conservative party, of its historical principles and functions, and its desperate attempt to outbid its opponents in popular concession, there is in the usually calm and somewhat sluggish current of English progress an exceptional freshet of almost revolutionary change. When the drag-chain thinks it politic to become an additional wheel, the course of the vehicle down hill will no doubt be pretty rapid for the time.

The Liberal leaders throughout the discussion insisted that the cases of the Irish and the English Establishment were entirely independent of each other, the Irish Church being the intrusive church of a minority, and therefore a contravention of the principle by which establishments now subsist, while the English Church was the church of the nation; and they repudiated any design of proceeding from disestablishment in one country to disestablishment in the other. Mr. Gladstone actually put forth a new and elaborate theory justifying the existence of the English Establishment; though, as this was the second theory of the relations between the Church and the State which had emanated from the mind of that philosophic statesman, the possibility of a third naturally loomed upon the excited minds of his clerical readers. The clergy, on the other hand, declared that the fate of the Church of England was bound up with that of her sister, and that the disestablishment of the one necessarily involved the disestablishment of the other, — a notion which the Tory leaders, who wished the country rectors to exert themselves vigorously in the county elections, of course sedulously fostered. But since the deed has been done, the clergy have not pressed its logical conse-

quence upon the nation any more than the land-owners have pressed upon it the obligation of proceeding to a general confiscation of property, which, as they averred, the secularization of the revenues of the Irish Establishment logically entailed. Bishoprics, deaneries, and rectories are still accepted and even sought for in a manner which denotes almost unshaken confidence in the stability of the institution. Nor does it appear that there is any strong movement at present on foot against the English Establishment, though the Liberation Society, under Mr. Miall, sticks steadily to its work. The attention of the nation seems to be entirely engrossed by Irish Land, and Popular Education.

The heaviest blow that has been struck, in connection with this measure, against the English Establishment is, in truth, the conduct of the English hierarchy and clergy themselves. Had they been wise, or had their leaders been wise for them, they would have recognized publicly and as an order the facts which individually and in the cooler moments of private conversation few of them were prepared to deny; they would have acknowledged that the Irish Establishment, as the Establishment of a small minority, could not stand; they would have distinguished its case from that of their own church; and they would have done all that reason and honor could demand or permit towards the Church in Ireland, by insisting that the life-interests of all its clergy should be scrupulously saved, that all those portions of its endowments which could fairly be called private should be preserved to it, and that when disestablished it should be entirely free. But corporate passion was too strong. Once more the nation has seen its authorized guides, on a great moral and political question, arrayed almost unanimously against reason and justice, and using in defence of an untenable position arguments which were repelled not only by the understanding, but by the moral sense, of every mechanic. A few clergymen of stronger heads and more independent character held out against the suicidal contagion. Bishop Thirlwall, after too long exemplifying the paralyzing effect of a state bishopric even on the most powerful mind, showed once more the moral energy of his happier hour. Dr. Temple added to the number of the great services

which he had rendered to the Church, by again coming forward with his usual courage as a representative of her better spirit. Dr. Mackarness, the new Bishop of Oxford, is stated to have been ejected from his seat in Convocation by his clerical brethren for refusing to take part in the agitation against the Disestablishment Bill. The Archbishop of Canterbury, a Scotchman and originally a Presbyterian, kept his head; and when the result of the general election had proved the case of the Irish Establishment to be hopeless, averted, by a timely submission to the will of the nation, a collision towards which his more violent colleagues were driving, and which might have been fatal both to the House of Lords and to the English Establishment; — rendering thereby, perhaps, a greater service to those two interests than to the nation. But the mass of the order went like a herd of bisons over the precipice, stimulated by the apocalyptic eloquence of the Bishop of Oxford, who himself slipped aside just in time to be "called by the voice," as he says in his farewell address to his clergy of the diocese of Oxford, to the rich see of Winchester and the Prelateship of the Garter. The clergy plunged headlong into the electioneering contest, — where their spiritual weapons were wielded in melancholy conjunction with landlord coercion and corruption, — and emulated the fury of Irish Orangemen and Tory squires in their denunciations of a minister who was personally noted for his religious character and his zeal as a churchman, and who appealed to the plainest precepts of Christianity in support of his policy; while the real leaders of the Tory party, under whom the clergy were fain to range themselves, were men notoriously indifferent to every religious object but the clerical vote, which they courted with scarcely disguised contempt, as the freethinking Bolingbroke had courted the vote of the fanatical clergy of his day. A clerical mass-meeting hooted down the Dean of Westminster, because, in rising to speak in favor of the Irish Establishment, he announced his intention of defending it from a Liberal point of view; though it might have been supposed that the most infuriated assembly would have suspended its uproar when promised so great an intellectual treat. But perhaps no incident in the whole struggle placed the clergy and

the Establishment in a worse light before the nation than the rejection of Sir Roundell Palmer by the clerical constituency of the University of Oxford. It crowned the political ignominy of that body. In the long list of Tory obscurities who had been sent to misrepresent learning and science in Parliament, not by the University, but by a non-resident Convocation, of which an overwhelming majority are clergymen, appeared two names endeared to the nation by great public services, — those of Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Gladstone. Both these men had been ejected, in violation of the special rule of the constituency, observed in all other cases, which gives a seat for life to a member once elected; Sir Robert Peel because he had consented to Catholic emancipation, — a measure the absolute necessity of which, to say nothing of justice, no sane man now doubts; Mr. Gladstone for having declared in favor of an extension of the suffrage, on which subject he was immediately outbid for the sake of office by the high-principled and inflexible gentleman who took his place. In both cases academical culture had been covered with an obloquy which was undeserved, for almost every man of academical distinction voted for Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Gladstone. But the case of Sir Roundell Palmer was stronger still. Not only was he, in the estimation of all men, marked out for the representation of an academical constituency by his rare union of the highest professional and political eminence with the highest literary cultivation, and for the representation of an ecclesiastical constituency by his known religious character and his conspicuous zeal as a churchman, — not only was he a man whom even political opponents, if they tendered the honor of the University, would have been exceedingly unwilling to reject, — but he had actually separated himself from his political friends on the question of the Irish Church, and rather than consent to disestablishment had sacrificed the immediate prospect of the Chancellorship, the highest prize of his profession. On all other questions he was so moderate a Liberal as hardly to be distinguishable from the Conservatives, with whom he had, in fact, always voted on questions affecting the University; and his candidature was supported by men of the most opposite opinions, — including the Tory leader elect, Lord Salisbury, —

out of simple respect to his eminence and worth. Yet the clerical constituency rejected him so decisively that his supporters did not venture to risk a poll. This was to tell the nation in the most unmistakable manner that the party of the clergy was the party of stolid and uncompromising reaction; that it would be satisfied with nothing but the most unreasoning subserviency to that cause; that it was just as anti-national as it had been in the days of Laud or of Sacheverell; that the experience of eventful centuries in England and in the world at large had been wasted upon it; and that if, by the aid of its Tory allies, it could ever regain power, it would renew the struggle against reason and justice, and try to close the door of hope against humanity in the future as it had done in the past.

In other ways, however, the disestablishment of the Irish Church will, no doubt, tell in course of time upon the question of disestablishment in England, assuming that the current of opinion continues to run in that direction. The ice has been broken. The nation has been familiarized with "sacrilege," and has learnt that the wrath of Heaven, so confidently denounced, does not immediately follow the abolition of a tax imposed upon a whole community for the maintenance of a sectional belief. Mr. Gladstone's legislative genius has devised for a process, the intricacy of which appalled politicians, a machinery, as it seems, perfectly effective and equally applicable to all cases. The discussion has been extended, by the act of the clergy themselves, from the question of the Irish Establishment to that of establishments in general, and has certainly not terminated in their favor. If the Irish Church prospers in its free condition, the contagion of its freedom will stimulate all in the sister church who, from whatever cause, are inclined to rebel against the yoke of the State. And that it will prosper there seems no reason to doubt. Its members must even by this time have begun to be somewhat ashamed of their panic fears. There is a legend in the Isle of Wight, of a custom-house officer who, having made himself very obnoxious to the smugglers, was carried off by them, blindfolded, and suspended over what he was told was a precipice, with a rope in his hands. He clung to the rope till his sinews cracked and he had suffered the agonies of death: then letting

go, he found that he had been all the time hanging six inches from the ground. Instead of falling into an abyss, the Church of Ireland finds herself on the morrow of disestablishment a very wealthy and powerful corporation, released from an odious position, emancipated from a degrading and paralyzing control, and free to extend her influence, under a happier star, over that large section of Christian society which spontaneously prefers her form of government and worship. By the simple convocation of a free assembly of her ministers and members, she is raised at once from the lowest and weakest position among all the churches of Christendom to one of strength and honor. Such a sight can hardly fail to disturb the self-complacent slavery of the Establishment with which the Church of Ireland remains spiritually one. Cromwell called Ireland a blank paper on which reforms might be tried which it would be impossible to introduce in the first instance in England. Ireland seems likely to play this part both with regard to the Church and with regard to the land.

But the forces at work for the subversion of the State Church of England are not merely political, or such as would be intensified by the success of disestablishment in Ireland. They are not external only, but internal. "The State Church," was the sagacious remark of a leading Voluntaryist, "has now too much religion in it to last." Its spiritual torpor during the last century was, in a worldly sense, its best safeguard. That torpor was disturbed only by the Bangorian controversy, a vast and nebulous hustle of theologians, or rather of ecclesiastical archæologists, in which, though almost every ecclesiastical question was mooted, it is scarcely possible to point out any definite issue, and which affected the disputants alone, and them rather as an intellectual controversy and a faction-fight than as a spiritual struggle. Far other controversies than the Bangorian rend the State Church of England now. With the revival of religious life which the last half-century has witnessed, though sometimes under forms apparently adverse to all religion, the spirit of serious inquiry has awakened; and within the political unity of the Anglican Church, clamped together as it were by the endowments, by the legal system, and by the pressure of social habit and con-

venience, are forms of earnest conviction ranging up to the verge of Ultramontanism on one side, and up to thoroughgoing Rationalism on the other; while strangely linked to these is the Evangelical party, which, if it believes its own language, must regard each of its two yoke-fellows as a daily destroyer of souls on a large scale. Almost everything in the way of swallowing theoretical inconsistencies for the sake of practical convenience is possible to the British mind; but even in the British mind there must be a limit to that power; and if the conflicting forces continue to act with their present intensity, we can scarcely be mistaken in saying that a disruption of the Establishment is near.

The ecclesiastical crisis at which England has now arrived, and which forms at least as interesting an object of study as the political crisis, with which it is intimately connected, is made up in fact of three elements, — the decadence, now pronounced and rapid throughout Western Christendom, of the principle of state churches; the development, under the stimulating influence of renewed spiritual life, of tendencies to divergence always latent in the equivocal creed and system of the English Establishment; and the influence upon English Churchmen of the great European movement to which the progress of science and criticism has given birth, and which is felt in England, as in other nations, both directly and in the way of reaction. The three elements, of course, intermingle, but by noting them severally we shall obtain our best clew to the labyrinth.

Austria herself has at last yielded to the tendency of modern civilization so far as to take steps towards the separation of the Church from the State, the importance of which is attested by the alarm and anger of the priesthood. Alone among powers styled civilized, Russia, half Tartar, half Byzantine, retains, with her unreformed calendar, her barbarous Caliphate, and inflicts penalties for conscientious renunciation of the Imperial religion. In England, the progress from the system of the Catholic Middle Ages and the statute *de heretico comburendo*, to the religious liberty and equality which are now fairly in sight, has been marked by several gradations of sentiment and policy. The most liberal statesmen of the Tudor period, among whom Burleigh himself

may in ecclesiastical matters be numbered, and whose spokesman was Bacon, went not beyond the idea of comprehension. They wished to extend as far as possible the bounds of the National Church, and to give as much scope as possible within its limits to Protestants of different shades of opinion. But they believed as firmly as any mediæval king or bishop in the necessity of an establishment and in the obligation of every subject of the realm in the last resort to conform to its ecclesiastical law. Nor could the theory of the religious duty of the State be held more firmly by the most High-Church Episcopalian than it was held by Cartwright and the Presbyterians, who only sought, in place of the Anglican yoke, to substitute that of Presbyterianism, as was decisively and cruelly proved during the period of Presbyterian ascendency which intervened between the fall of Charles I. and the rise of Cromwell to supreme power. The extreme sectaries alone were led, rather by the necessity of their position as the objects of universal persecution than by their perception of a higher principle, to contend for something like a doctrine of toleration. A policy of comprehension, however, did not suit the imperious temper of Elizabeth; and when the support which danger abroad had lent to good counsels at home was withdrawn by the decisive victory of the nation over Spain, the Queen freely indulged her tyrannical self-will in the persecution of the Puritans through the Court of High Commission, and thus did much to prepare the way for the troubles which ensued, the blame of which has been too exclusively laid upon the Stuarts. The policy of the Protectorate was comprehension, carried however much farther than it would have been carried by the most liberal of preceding statesmen, so that the National Church, on the Protector's model, would have included in its pale all sects of Trinitarian Protestants, except (if it could be called an exception) the co-religionists of Laud. To the case of these men, who had just failed in an attempt to subvert at once Protestantism and liberty, and to that of the Roman Catholics, members of a vast European conspiracy against the existence of all Protestant nations, the large mind of the Protector practically applied, to an extent previously unexampled, the principle of toleration; but the law, so far as they were concerned, remained intolerant, and could not have

been openly changed without producing a national convulsion. The great step from comprehension to toleration, that is, to the legal recognition of citizenship without conformity to the Established Church, was taken after the Revolution of 1688, the victory in which had been achieved by the aid of the Protestant dissenters, who had nobly forgotten their own sufferings, to stand by the side of their Anglican persecutors in opposition to the insidious indulgence of the Popish king. This toleration embraced at first Protestants alone, the European struggle between Catholicism and Protestantism being still too desperate to admit of the recognition of Catholics as citizens in a Protestant country; but when Louis XIV. had ceased to trouble, the fear and resentment of the Protestants gradually died away, and had it not been for the reaction caused by the excesses of the French Revolution, which threw back reform all over Europe, Catholic emancipation would probably have been carried long before 1829. That measure, with the nearly simultaneous repeal of the Test and Corporation Act, requiring an Anglican test as a qualification for office (which, however, had already been reduced practically to a shadow by means of annual acts of indemnity), completed the policy of toleration; and no civil office, with the nominally all-important, but practically insignificant, exception of the crown, is now confined to members of the Established Church. Even the Chancellor, the keeper of the king's conscience, may be a Dissenter; and a Roman Catholic is at present Chancellor of Ireland. It remains only, to pass by a final step from toleration to religious equality, and to complete the victory of modern civilization over the Middle Ages by declaring all religions equal before the law, abolishing the State Church, and renouncing State interference with religion. This has already been done in the case of Ireland, and would have been done much earlier if Irishmen could have brought themselves, instead of crusading against the liberties of Italy, to act with the English Liberals for the emancipation of their own country. There is another policy, which prevails in France, — that of subsidizing all religions alike, on the ground that all are equally useful to the statesman; but this policy has, in the recent legislation, been decisively repudiated, and is likely always to be repudiated, by the British nation. To subsidize

Popery would of course have been peculiarly hateful to Protestants, and this would in itself have been fatal to the plan of Lord Russell and those who with him advocated general endowment. But the notion of deliberately establishing any religion for purposes of political and social expediency, without reference to its truth, is altogether alien to the English, and, if possible, still more so to the Scottish mind. Acquiescence in an existing establishment from motives partly social is a different thing.

Meantime the original principle of establishments, which was, that the State was bound by religious duty to support and propagate the one true faith, has been tacitly abandoned. Statesmen now defend the Establishment, not on the ground that its doctrines are exclusively true, but on the ground that its religion is the religion of the majority. It is a descent from revelation to counting heads.

Whether the religion of the State Church is the religion of the majority in England is, accordingly, a question fiercely debated, but debated without the means of a satisfactory solution. The religious census caused such heart-burnings that the government was compelled to give it up; and there is little use in guessing at statistics. It may safely be said that in England and Wales, among those who regularly attend any place of worship, the number of Churchmen does not exceed that of Dissenters in a proportion of more than four to three, — a majority which constitutes rather a precarious title to the character of a National Church. But a more instructive estimate may be formed by reference to classes and districts. In countries where she exists, by whatever name, on the voluntary system, the Anglican Church is characteristically that of a wealthy and refined class, which finds her hierarchical form of government and her regular and stately ritual congenial to its taste. And this is probably pretty much the measure of her hold upon the spontaneous allegiance of the nation in England; in fact her hold in England, where the laity are denied any voice in her administration, may reasonably be supposed to be less than in America and other countries, where the laity are associated with the clergy, and a somewhat more democratic character is given to the Church

government. Of the tradesmen of the towns in England, a large proportion, including generally the most religious, are Protestant nonconformists of different denominations, principally Wesleyan Methodists and Baptists. The artisan masses of London and the great manufacturing cities have grown up, and remain, for the most part, outside of any religious organization. Of the rural population, the squires are, of course, almost universally thoroughgoing State-Churchmen. So are their tenant-farmers, after the fashion which Tennyson's Lincolnshire Farmer portrays with little exaggeration. The peasants go to the parish church spontaneously for christening, marriage, and burial; and a part of them — in some parishes a considerable part — go on Sundays with more or less regularity, in obedience to the law of the clerico-squirearchical *régime*, seconded by personal feeling towards the clergyman, if he is a good man. When the clergyman happens to be a powerful preacher of the kind which their rude taste admires, and especially if he preaches extempore and, as they think, by inspiration, they will resort to the church for the sake of his preaching. But they are rarely communicants; and if their religious feeling is strong, they generally find their way to the little Methodist chapel of barn-like appearance, which stands, like a poacher lurking at the side of a game-preserve, in some nook of the clerico-squirearchical domain, and where religious enthusiasm and the democratic propensity together obtain the gratification which the parish church denies. The case of Wales closely resembles that of Ireland: here also the Anglican Church is that of the English, of the gentry, of the minority; while the Celtic masses, a large proportion of whom still speak the Celtic language, have a religion of their own, though not in this case Roman Catholicism, but Calvinistic Methodism, the fervor of which is as attractive as the observances of Roman Catholicism, to the emotional nature of the Celt. Accordingly we see that an agitation to extend the Irish measure of disestablishment to Wales has already been commenced, with what hope of success does not yet appear. Cornwall, another ancient sanctuary of the Celt, — where, till about a century ago, the Celtic language was spoken, — left in a state of practical heathenism by the An-

glican bishops and clergy of the West, was converted to Christianity by Wesley, and Wesleyanism is the religion of the people in that district; the smallness of the congregations in some of the well-endowed churches of the Establishment being as scandalous in Cornwall as in Ireland itself.

The artisans, whom the late Reform Act has admitted to political power, and whose influence will be more felt as they grow more accustomed to the exercise of the franchise and become better organized, are, to a great extent, not merely indifferent, but hostile to the Establishment. They positively dislike clerical ascendency and everything by which it is supported. Such opinion as exists among them is mainly of the secularist type, a startling proof of which was seen in the large number of votes polled by Mr. Bradlaugh the Iconoclast, at Northampton, in the late general election. On the other hand, the fear of secularism may bring to the support of the Establishment some of the more conservative and orthodox Dissenters, especially the Wesleyans, whose attitude towards the Church, when they were not brought into collision with its political privileges, has always been, like that of their founder, one of respectful regret and distant attachment rather than one of opposition.

Reference has already been made to the part played by the clergy in the late struggle between Mr. Gladstone and his Tory opponents, — a struggle in which the antagonism of the aristocracy and all its followers to the people and the popular chief has been unusually marked, and the consequences of taking the anti-popular side therefore unusually serious. A few clergymen of eminence, men naturally of strong popular sympathies, — Dean Hook, Dr. Temple, Archdeacon Sandford, and Dr. Miller, — wrestle against the fatal bias which draws their order to the side of political reaction, and forces it always to fight under the banner of Toryism against progress and the aspirations of the nation. The political record of the established hierarchy and clergy is a sinister one, and weighs heavily against them in the judgment of the people. Passive instruments of the despotism of the Tudors, they actively conspired with the Stuarts against the liberties of the nation, and were, even more than the political reactionists, the authors of the great civil war which was justly called *Bellum Episcopale.*

They purchased royal support for priestly aggrandizement, by promulgating doctrines respecting the divine right of kings and the duty of unlimited submission on the part of the subject, which in depth of servility literally exceeded anything ever uttered by Oriental slaves. They were partners, both in England and Scotland, of the tyranny of the Restoration, and supported the absolutism of James II., till he laid his hand upon their own property and privileges, when they at once gave divine right and passive obedience to the winds. Scarcely was the Revolution of 1688 accomplished, when they reappeared as the enemies of religious liberty and constitutional government, and began to conspire for the restoration of the Stuarts. For their own anti-national objects they combined with the political Jacobites in overthrowing the great Whig Ministry of Anne, and in cancelling the results of immense national efforts by the disgraceful treaty of Utrecht; and their leader on this occasion was Bolingbroke, a freethinker and a debauchee, who bought clerical support by passing the most infamous of the persecuting laws against Dissenters. During the half-century which followed, they continued to be the active agents of Jacobite designs, and twice contributed, by their intrigues and their incendiary preaching, to involve the nation in civil war. The bishops, being appointed by the crown, were, of course, Hanoverian, and in all respects more liberal and enlightened than the mass of the clergy; but they had little influence over the fanatical and Trulliberian crowd. All hope of restoring the despotism of the Stuarts being extinct, the clergy welcomed a new head of reaction in George III., adapted their theories of divine right to the circumstances of the Hanoverian dynasty, supported the good king's encroachments on constitutional liberty, and preached his Colonial and French wars. Their sinister activity, in conjunction with the Tory party at the beginning of the Colonial war, is specially attested by a passage in one of the letters of Burke. It was Bishop Horsley, the leader of his order, who said in the House of Lords that the people had nothing to do with the laws but to obey them. As a body, the clergy opposed Catholic emancipation, the Reform Bill of 1832, and the whole train of liberal measures which marked the revival

of political life in England after the peace of 1815, and the defeat of which would unquestionably have plunged the nation into confusion, probably into civil war. They are now again found laying their church across the path of legislative improvement in a case touching at once the honor and the most vital interests of the nation. Not only political, but even philanthropic progress, if in the remotest degree connected with Liberalism, has been tacitly discouraged by the State clergy, if not actively opposed. In the majority of thirty-two, by which Romilly's bill for the abolishment of capital punishment in cases of petty theft was thrown out in the House of Lords, voted one archbishop and six bishops, whose conduct is justly ascribed by Romilly, in his diary, not so much to unchristian thirst for blood, as to political influence. There is nothing to set against this dark history. We look in vain for any great moral question on which the clergy have guided England right, for any great reform of which they have been the originators or the leaders, for any case in which they have stood forth boldly, like the prophets of Israel, to rebuke national crime. The crusade against slavery and the slave-trade, the mitigation of the penal code, prison reform, the movement in favor of popular education, the anti-liquor movement, — the chief honor of all these belongs to laymen, to Dissenters, to heretics. More has been done by the Quakers to make the laws of England Christian than by the clergy. Those who in the dark hour of conquest or revenge have pleaded for Christian mercy and forbearance towards subject races have listened in vain for a word of encouragement from clerical lips; they have had too much reason to believe that the sympathies of the clergy were rather on the other side. When Governor Eyre was discharged by the squires who acted as ministers of justice at Market Drayton, the cheering was led by a clergyman; a Queen's chaplain carried away the palm of indecency at the Southampton banquet in honor of the same hero; and the Bishop of Jamaica himself came forward as an admiring supporter of the butcher of his helpless flock, in extenuation of which it may perhaps be said that the bishop had not himself witnessed the massacre, being a non-resident chief shepherd and drawing his salary in England.

Against some acts, indeed, clerical denunciations have been launched, but they have been acts, not of rapacity or cruelty, but of mercy and justice, — Catholic emancipation, the repeal of the Test and Corporation Act, the abolition of the Establishment which had filled Ireland with rancorous dissension. In the political history of England, whatever the State clergy have cursed, Heaven has signally blessed, — blessed not only in the increased prosperity and the strengthened unity, but in the improved morality, of the nation. In Ireland the case was naturally worse. The State Church there was not only the friend and supporter, she was to a terrible extent the organ, of Ascendency, and the active instrument of iniquity and oppression. Irish prelates in the last century were personages as worldly and as unedifying in all their ways as the prince-bishops of Germany, with the graces of Irish taskmastership superadded. It is needless to say that all this proves nothing against religion, nothing against Christianity, nothing against clergymen: it proves only that the union of Church and State makes the Church political, without making the State religious. Probably, all the time, the clergy as a body were above the average of their countrymen in personal intelligence and virtue. And it is a fact never to be forgotten that on the occasion of the repeal of the corn-laws, — a measure which it was supposed would lower the incomes of the country clergy as well as the rents of the land-owners (though in fact all parties alike have been gainers by the removal of protection), — while the squires were rabid in their opposition, the clergymen scarcely moved at all; — a strong indication that it was at any rate not from sordid motives that they chose the side of political reaction.

A national system of popular education — not necessarily one treating with procrustean uniformity all parts of a country the social and economical circumstances of which are so varied, but one which shall afford security to the nation for the education of all its citizens — has become an acknowledged necessity since the recent extension of the franchise, and in view of the still further extension which is sure to follow; for every one feels that of all tyrannies an uneducated democracy would be the worst. But it will be very difficult for the State to establish such a system without coming into mortal collision

with the clergy. Of late years, and since the movement in favor of popular education has gained ground, the clergy, especially those in the rural parishes, have displayed great zeal and great self-sacrifice in supporting the parish schools, their contributions to which, considering the amount of their incomes and the numerous calls upon their charity, put those of the wealthy land-owners to shame. But they insist that education shall be religious, and that the religion taught shall be theirs; and while the government professes to maintain Anglicanism, and taxes the country for its propagation, it cannot very consistently refuse deference to their demand. From the moment when the State first tentatively interfered for the improvement of education, by making grants to schools which reached a certain standard and fulfilled certain conditions as to the character of teachers and the structure of the buildings, the war between the clerical and secular parties has not ceased to rage; the relations between the National Society, which is the organ of church education, and the Education Committee of the Privy Council, which is the organ of the State, being the usual field of conflict. At present the bone (as Mr. Bright, who is impatient of minor controversies, says, the *dry* bone) of contention is the "conscience clause." But hitherto, the action of the State having been merely subsidiary, and all the parishes having been left at liberty to accept or reject its aid, it has been possible, by a series of uneasy compromises, to avert the decisive struggle which broader and more effective legislation must apparently entail. It is a segment of that irrepressible conflict between mediæval authority and modern civilization on the great battle-field of education, which is being waged over the whole of Europe, and of which America has not seen the last.

On the Universities and the higher education the domination of the Establishment has pressed with crushing weight, and here also there is now a fierce recoil. Till 1854 all who were not members of the Established Church, that is to say, at least half of the inhabitants of England and Wales, and a large majority of those of the three kingdoms, were entirely excluded from Oxford and Cambridge by religious tests, the outrageous stringency of which was a signal instance of the disregard of political religion for the sanctity of conscience; boys of sixteen

having been compelled to subscribe to the whole mass of controverted doctrine embodied in the Thirty-nine Articles. Almost all the emoluments and almost all the offices, whether of government or education, were confined to Anglican clergymen, and a vacancy in one of the few lay fellowships occurred only just in time to save Newton from being turned out of his college for not being in orders. As a matter of course, physical science, and all other studies not cognate or congenial to the clerical profession, were excluded or depressed. The Universities were thus cut off both from the nation and from the age, and remained mere clerical seminaries and organs of the Establishment. Several generations of uneducated rulers were the price paid by the nation for this encouragement of religion. At last the Universities have been partly emancipated from their death-in-life. Nonconformists have been admitted to the course of education and to the lower degrees, though they are still excluded from the higher degrees, which form the qualification for the governing body of the University, and from the headships and fellowships of colleges, and the professorships. A certain proportion of the fellowships, with which the college tutorships are connected, have been thrown open to laymen ; and scientific and other professorships tenable by laymen, which the clerical government had allowed to become ciphers, have been restored to activity and been better endowed. But the headships of colleges are still in almost all cases confined to clergymen, and the influence of the heads, backed by that of Episcopal visitors who have a veto on college legislation, and by the clerical Convocation or Senate of the University, is sufficient materially to retard a progress which is every day becoming of more vital necessity ; especially at Oxford, where you may see a great college with rich endowments held in a state of utter uselessness by the determination of its clerical head that it shall serve no purposes but those of his own profession. Hence the conflict is already renewed ; and a bill for the total abolition of university tests has passed the House of Commons several times by large majorities, and is now suspended only by the veto of the House of Lords. Again the clerical party in alarm embraces the knees of Toryism, by making Lord Salisbury, a man of no academical claims, Chancellor of the University of Ox-

ford. Meantime the most active intellects in the Universities, thwarted by clerical ascendency in their daily duties and aspirations, and unable to make head against its forces on the spot, carry their arms, which are not deficient in keenness, to the aid of the party of progress on an ampler and more hopeful field.

The great strength of the Establishment lies in the social usefulness of its clergy, especially in the country parishes. When the country clergyman approaches his ideal, — which, under a system of private patronage, and one legalizing beneath the cover of a mock simony law the sale and purchase of "cures of souls," is, it may be well supposed, by no means invariably the case, — he is the gentler and better part of the rural *régime;* the counsellor and almoner of the hamlet; the organ of a civilizing influence which the squire even, when resident, does not diffuse in superabundant measure; the softener, so far as is possible, of the social and economical millstone under which the British peasant is too often ground. His wife, if she is a good woman, and the country rectory is propitious to womanly excellence, is as beneficent, and as strong a pillar of the Establishment, as himself. "In Protestant countries," says Mr. Lecky, "where the marriage of the clergy is fully recognized, it has, indeed, been productive of the greatest and the most unequivocal benefits. Nowhere, it may be confidently asserted, does Christianity assume a more beneficial or a more winning form than in those gentle clerical households which stud our land, constituting, as Coleridge said, the one idyl of modern life, the most perfect type of domestic peace, and the centres of civilization in the remotest village. Notwithstanding some class-narrowness and professional bigotry, notwithstanding some unworthy but half-unconscious mannerism which is often most unjustly stigmatized as hypocrisy, it would be difficult to find in any other quarter so much happiness at once diffused and enjoyed, or so much virtue attained with so little tension or struggle. Combining with his sacred calling a warm sympathy with the intellectual, social, and political movements of his time, possessing the enlarged practical knowledge of a father of a family, and entering with a keen zest into the occupations and the amusements of his parishioners, a good clergyman will rarely obtrude his convictions into secular

spheres, but yet will make them apparent in all. They will be revealed by a higher and deeper moral tone, by a more scrupulous purity in word and action, by an all-pervasive gentleness which refines and softens and mellows, and adds as much to the charm as to the excellence of the character in which it is displayed. In visiting the sick, relieving the poor, instructing the young, and discharging a thousand delicate offices for which a woman's tact is especially needed, his wife finds a sphere of labor which is at once intensely active and intensely feminine, and her example is not less beneficial than her ministrations." *Felices nimium sua si bona norint agricolæ.* To those who are familiar with English country life, this will appear rather an idyllic picture of their ordinary experiences, especially as regards "sympathy with the intellectual, social, and political movements of the time," unless the term "movement" includes retrogradation. But it is founded in reality, and its political significance is all the greater because its author, though most careful never to give offence by directly impugning established tenets, manifestly does not receive for gospel all that these clergymen believe; in fact, teaches principles of historical criticism, and propagates a general habit of mind, which tend visibly to put an end to the usefulness of clergymen, supposing their usefulness to be at all dependent on the sincerity of their convictions. Indeed the Establishment numbers some of its most zealous upholders among men who have long ago tacitly withdrawn their allegiance from its creed, and who, though they may attend its worship as a social duty, and by way of setting an example to their dependents, would, if it attempted to meddle with their consciences or to exercise any spiritual authority over them, at once let it understand the real nature of their support. By far the most telling argument in favor of the Irish Establishment was drawn from the social functions discharged by the clergy as a resident gentry in a country where so many of the land-owners were absentees. It was said that the Catholic peasantry even used the Protestant rectors as their bankers. Such a plea for the maintenance of a spiritual institution reminded one a little of the alleged Irish practice of stopping a hole in the slating with a silver plate. If politicians want to stop a hole in their slating, they must do

it with a slate, not with the organs of man's spiritual life. If they want resident proprietors, they must amend the laws which regulate the distribution of land.

The force, however, of this social argument is so great, even with very advanced Liberals, that, in spite of all the weights in the other scale, — and though the Conservative party in England is every day losing its old "church-and-king" character and becoming more and more a party of the rich, ready to throw everything overboard except the single object of a plutocracy, — the Establishment, so far as the political situation is concerned, would probably yet have a considerable lease of life. An attempt would, at all events, be made, in the first instance, to reform it by admitting into convocation the lay element, the absence of which reduces the deliberations of that body to a farce; by redistributing at the same time the clerical representation, of which far too large a portion is at present assigned to the chapters; by checking the abuses of patronage; and by giving to each congregation some control over the action of its minister. But, as has been said before, other than political forces are at work.

It is a well-known saying of Chatham, that the Church of England has Calvinistic Articles and a Popish Liturgy. The statesmen of Elizabeth, anxious above all things for political unity and tranquillity, made between the warring ecclesiastical elements the best compromise that they could, and it was one which did credit to their sagacity as statesmen. The only drawback was that, whereas a practical compromise is often, as in the case of the British Constitution, full of vitality, a spiritual compromise is a *caput mortuum*. A *caput mortuum*, spiritually speaking, during the reign of Elizabeth, the State Church of England remained. Life of a certain kind was at length infused into the dry bones by the party of Bancroft and Laud, who, in sympathy with the general European reaction, both ecclesiastical and political, developed the Popish and hierarchical element of the compromise till they brought themselves, and the crown as their confederate, into fatal collision with the Protestantism of the nation. The High-Church movement in the reign of Charles I., with its sacerdotalism and its sacramentalism, its decorations and genuflexions, its

revival of monachism and the confessional, its theories of apostolical succession and its affected severance from the Protestant churches of the Continent, with its conversions of clergymen and ladies of quality to Rome by insinuating Jesuits, was a very exact prototype of the Ritualism of the present day. History never repeats itself; but the same causes produce the same effects, and the sacerdotal and sacramental element in Anglicanism is the same now as it was in the time of Charles I.

From the Restoration to the latter part of the eighteenth century the Church of England was again spiritually almost a *caput mortuum*. Jacobitism and Toryism were her life. The secession of the Nonjurors was political, not ecclesiastical, and nothing but the character of Ken saved it from being ecclesiastically ridiculous. The squabbles of the Whig bishops with the Tory parsons and the noise of the Bangorian controversy were sufficiently annoying to the statesmen of the day to induce them, as Hallam says, to "sprinkle a little dust upon the angry insects" by the suppression of Convocation. But of everything like spiritual life the Church of Sterne, Prettyman, and Cornwallis was almost as destitute as the Church of Dubois and Talleyrand, though she was less indecent, and, from her clergy being married, morally less corrupt. With John Wesley the revival of spiritual life began; and it is remarkable that his little fraternity held its first meeting in an Oxford College specially destined by the mediæval bishops who founded it to combat the early Reformation. Rejected by the Church of the rich, Wesley became the great organizer of the spiritual life of the poor, — for whom the Establishment, which had thrown off what was popular in Romanism — its pilgrimages, its processions, and its saint-worship — without adopting what was popular in Protestantism, had little comfort or attraction, — and founded that mighty monument of his ecclesiastical statesmanship as well as of his religious insight, which, if the work of the master is not marred by inferior hands, will wrestle not in vain with the emissaries of Loyola for the spiritual allegiance of the masses on this continent. But though Wesley was cast out of the Establishment, his movement contributed to the development within it of the Evangelical party, which

engrossed almost the whole of its spiritual life during the latter part of the last and the earlier part of the present century. This party had its point of attachment in the "Calvinistic Articles," as that of Laud had in the "Popish Liturgy," and was the heir, though the remote heir, of the Puritanism of Ridley and Hooper. Its cardinal doctrine was justification by faith. Its great teacher was St. Paul. Its chief ordinance was preaching. Sacerdotalism and sacramentalism it utterly rejected, reducing the Eucharist to a commemorative rite, and superseding baptismal regeneration by that which was perhaps the most salient characteristic of the party, — the theory of conversion. It vilipended apostolical succession, and every claim not derived from the immediate operation of the Spirit. Of church authority it knew nothing; the letter of the Bible being to it all in all; and, like other ultra-biblical sects and schools, it put the Old Testament entirely on a level with the New. Its ceremonial was confined to the Puritan observance of the Sabbath, which may be said to have stood to it in the place of sacraments as well as of ritual. It waged war through its pulpits against the prominent vices and frivolities of the day, — card-playing, dancing, and racing, to which, and to fox-hunting, the clergy of the Establishment as well as the laity were extensively addicted, — planting its batteries especially in the watering-places and other centres of fashionable resort. Its own manners were austerely religious, and it abounded in prayer-meetings and other religious exercises, derided as Methodistical by its opponents. Being anti-sacerdotal, it, without breaking any rubric as to clerical ministrations, conceded a prominent position in its own inner church to religious laymen; and Wilberforce was, as Lord Shaftesbury is now, a lay bishop of the Evangelical party. Viewed with dislike by the hierarchy and by the great body of the clergy, who suspected its orthodoxy, and often winced under its spoken or tacit rebukes, it, without seceding or thinking of secession, sat loose on the Establishment, and had a pretty definite organization of its own. Its May meetings in Exeter Hall, so often a theme of ridicule to its High-Church or epicurean critics, were its synods; the Bible Society was the characteristic organ of its missionary enterprise, while the more orthodox found their

organ in the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; and its gifted preachers looked for advancement, not to the Prime Minister or the bishop, but to Simeon's Trustees, the administrators of a fund established by the greatest clerical leader of the party, the excellent man who restored religious life in Cambridge, and destined for the purchase of advowsons in great watering-places and wherever the preacher of the gospel might be most needed. With orthodox Dissenters, especially with the semi-Anglican Wesleyans, the Evangelicals have always freely fraternized, and in truth there is nothing but a name between them. Thus situated and thus organized, the Evangelical section of the Establishment presented many of the features and possessed many of the virtues of a free church. It was untainted by political time-serving, and produced no Bishop Cornwallis soliciting Mr. Pitt to deal with the highest offices of the Church as though they were the coins on the table of a money-changer, in order to bring about "an accommodation in his favor." It took an earnest and fearless part in philanthropic movements such as those against the slave-trade and slavery, with which the names of the Clapham sect, as they were then called, are forever identified, and freely co-operated with Dissenters in works of charity and mercy. The Evangelicals were very deficient, as a body, in scholarship and culture. They were utterly uncritical in their use of the Bible, which few of them probably ever thought of reading in the original, much less of studying with any exegetical or historical apparatus of a scholarly kind; and thus when disturbed by the advance of criticism, they have assailed it with a fanatical antipathy which in an age not to be scared by denunciations is their own ruin. Their narrow sabbatarianism, and their hostility to amusements vicious under Charles II. or George IV., but innocent under Victoria, put stumbling-blocks in the way of many and set human nature against religion. It was said, and the charge was at least plausible, that they were apt, in separating themselves from the world, to have a Vanity Fair of their own. Nor did their popular preachers always escape the snares with which the calling of a popular preacher is beset, especially when he is surrounded by female devotees and has "slippers enough for a centipede." Never-

theless in its first and best estate the Evangelical party wrought a great reform, social as well as religious; awoke many from mere grossness and frivolity to spiritual life; produced religious characters of great excellence and beauty in many spheres (that of Captain Hedley Vickers, the Evangelical soldier of the army in the Crimea, being one of the latest and finest) and established an indefeasible claim to the gratitude of the English Church.

But from its first and best estate it suddenly fell, like the Son of the Morning. It was still in the Establishment, though hardly of it, and therefore liable at any time to become, as at last it did become, the prey of politicians. Lord Palmerston was a master of the art of corruption, whose skill was all the more admirable because the coarse instruments which had been used by Walpole or even by Pitt were no longer at his command, and indeed would have been powerless in a plutocracy, where the minister has to buy men who, if it were a question of money, could buy the minister. By a skilful use of social influence, the one kind of bribery which tells with men of great wealth and low social position, he so effectually debauched the plutocratic element of the Liberal party, that he might with confidence predict that under Mr. Gladstone, whom he naturally disliked and wished to disinherit of the leadership, the Liberal majority in Parliament would soon become a minority; though the ultimate result has proved that even the shrewdest tacticians cannot afford in their calculations to leave the moral forces entirely out of view. He completely domesticated the chiefs of the public press, who left the salons of Cambridge House, where they had been the objects of the most marked attentions and the most flattering confidences on the part of the minister, to pour forth in their morning columns streams of adulation as servile as any ever paid for by Newcastle or Walpole; so that, by a catastrophe unforeseen by Montesquieu, the executive and the power of the press were united in the same hands. Glancing over the political field, Lord Palmerston marked the latent electoral power of the Evangelical party, which by this time was great, especially in the cities. With its leader, Lord Shaftesbury, he was connected by marriage. Through Lord

Shaftesbury, as the Premier's vicar-general, the patronage of the crown, of which scarcely a rivulet had before reached the Evangelicals, suddenly flowed over them in a golden river. Evangelical clergymen scarcely reputed orthodox, and some of whom the other party accused of being unable to read the New Testament in Greek, mounted in rapid and apparently endless succession to bishoprics and deaneries. It was said, jeeringly, that Mr. Spurgeon would be the next appointment. The ecclesiastical adventurers and mitre-hunters, with whose unlovely existence and activity every one who has seen much of the workings of a state church is too familiar, immediately taking their cue, set their sails to the prevailing wind; and sermons full of Evangelicism, at once the most unctuous and sulphureous (for the system, like Scotch Calvinism, has its sulphureous element), were emulously preached by clergymen, the date of whose conversion to those doctrines from a cynical and somewhat sceptical Liberalism was recent and could easily be fixed. At once a sad revolution was wrought, and a party which, with all its defects, had hitherto preserved its independence and its purity, sank into a dominant section of a State Church, and took its place with epicureans, jobbers, railroad-men, and filibusters, in the personal following of Lord Palmerston, supporting, among other things, a foreign policy of blustering aggression, a Cromwellism out of date, with which assuredly neither Wilberforce nor the gospel had anything to do. When, in the case of the war with China, Lord Palmerston, upholding what he called the national honor, impersonated in opium smugglers, — and defeated in the House of Commons by a vote which represented, if ever a vote did, the conscience of the nation, — appealed to the country, then still glowing with the Russian war, against the sentence, the Evangelicals responded in solid column to the appeal; and it was said that members of the party, who till then had stood aloof from politics, as too worldly, cast a vote on that occasion for the first time. The "Record," the great religious organ of the party, which made a point of treating politics from the religious point of view, found itself called to the task of lending a religious support to the strangest Saul ever seen among the prophets, — a minister who was personally an Antinomian

without the theology; some of whose associations were scandalous even to the world as it goes; who, ever genial, when prize-fighting was in vogue had a good word for prize-fighting; and who unconsciously put his boot-heel upon the cardinal tenet of the party by proclaiming in an after-dinner speech that all men were born good, — the natural dictator, in short, of a rich, sceptical, and pleasure-seeking society, with a lingering touch of the buccaneer. This task the "Record" performed in such a manner that, among those who did not care for religion, disgust was swallowed up in ridicule, and among those who did care for religion, ridicule was swallowed up in disgust. If it did not actually call Lord Palmerston the Man of God, as its adversaries delighted to assert, it did prostitute religion, even what is deepest and most sacred in religion, in a way at once calamitous and terribly instructive. The death of Lady Palmerston, a clever woman of the world, the popular and versatile president of her husband's motley assemblies, whom, with her not very Evangelical history, people of sense would have been glad to see committed quietly to the earth, was recently the signal for another display of the same kind, which called forth another burst of derision and contempt. In the change which, under the Palmerstonian *régime*, passed over the character of the Evangelical party in England was represented on a small scale the change which must have passed over the character of the Christian Church when she mounted the throne with Constantine.

The party is still numerous, and counts among its members men of mark and worth, among whom Lord Shaftesbury himself, as a philanthropist, must not be forgotten. But with its independence it has lost its dignity and its truly spiritual character. Time and the progress of religious thought are telling on it besides: its special enthusiasms are growing cold; its special ordinances are becoming hollow; its special position, as the only religious section of a church with a card-playing and fox-hunting clergy, and a laity of corresponding habits, belongs to the past; its clerical leaders have begun to be touched by the attractions of sacerdotalism, and to incline to the Ritualistic side; some of the names most eminent in its history, those of Wilberforce and Simeon among the number, are

now found among the Ritualists or in the Church of Rome. Finally it has begun to beat its own life out by dashing itself in desperate hostility against criticism and science. As a great party in the English Church, it will probably soon pay the debt of nature.

Meantime the "Popish Liturgy" has been bearing fruits after its kind. The great liberal movement of 1815–1840 threatened old institutions in the Church as well as in the State; and — though, so far as the endowments of the Church were concerned, the wave, after sweeping away some supernumerary Irish bishoprics and a part of the plethoric wealth of the English chapters, was, for the time, stayed — Catholic emancipation, and the repeal of the Test and Corporation Act, entirely cut away the principle on which the ecclesiastical polity had been founded, and left the Church not only in a precarious position, but in one untenable and degrading in the eyes of the High-Churchmen. At the same time a general advance of liberal and even sceptical opinion, closely connected with the political revolution, threatened with destruction whatever reverence for church authority might still linger in the land. The natural consequence was a reaction among the clergy, parallel to the reaction in politics which brought the Conservatives back to power in 1841, and in deep though at first unconscious sympathy with the contemporaneous reaction, ecclesiastical and political, on the Continent against the tendencies of the French Revolution. To stem the current of liberalism and to assert the old and higher principle of the union between Church and State was the first object of the English movement, the leaders of which, at a later stage Romanizers and at last Romanists, were in its earliest stage prominent in depriving Sir Robert Peel of his seat for Oxford as a punishment for his apostasy in carrying Catholic emancipation. But a second object, which soon became predominant, was the revival of church authority as a basis whereon the Church might rest when state protection was withdrawn. In relation to this second object, the movement necessarily assumed, before it had gone far, a mediævalizing character. Its natural centre was Oxford, which was not only, as has been already said, a clerical University and one absorbed in clerical studies to the exclusion of history

and science, but half monastic, since the fellows of colleges were, as they still are, bound to celibacy as a condition of holding their fellowships; while, in the absence of any legal power of amending college statutes, the codes of mediæval founders, instinct with the spirit of Catholicism, still remained in force, and the beauty of the mediæval buildings drew the hearts of their inhabitants towards the religious past. Since the suspension of the Convocation at Westminster, the Convocation of the University of Oxford had in some measure supplied the place of that assembly as the organ of clerical sentiment; and there the party first gave public proof of its existence in the condemnation of Dr. Hampden, who had been appointed Professor of Theology by the Whigs, for writings resembling in spirit those of the Latitudinarians of the previous century, the condemnation of whom, in the person of Hoadley, had been the last act of the ecclesiastical Convocation. Once started, the movement advanced rapidly towards its destined goal. Eucharistical real presence, the Anglican version of transubstantiation, with which it is identical in all its consequences, and baptismal regeneration, as the twin pledges of sacerdotal ascendency, were naturally the first doctrines to be asserted. The whole train of cognate doctrines and practices, the supremacy of church authority over conscience, the necessity of priestly absolution, justification by good works, penance, asceticism, the celibacy of the clergy, monasticism, saint-worship, mariolatry, prayers for the dead, ritualism, followed in due course. Belief in ecclesiastical miracles was revived, and a series of Lives of the English Saints was written, it may almost be said, on the avowed principle that it is salutary and meritorious to put yourself into a frame of mind in which you can accept religious legends without regard to their truth. Patristic literature, and the patristic system of mystical and symbolical interpretation, were also exhumed, and selections from the Fathers, boldly presenting their grotesque irrationality, were translated for the benefit of the faithful. Laud and Ken had, of course, been exalted from the first; but soon Thomas à Becket, unsainted by Henry VIII. and Cranmer, was resainted as the martyred champion of church liberties, and a life of him, full of pious figments, was published

by Mr. Hurrell Froude. The fathers of the Reformation become the objects of depreciation, before long of sneers and hatred; a memorial to Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, erected at this time near the spot of their martyrdom at Oxford, was the protest of the loyal adherents of the Reformation, and marks the field of the ecclesiastical battle. Communion with the Protestant churches on the Continent was ostentatiously abjured as it had been in the time of Laud; a plan, favored by the Court, for establishing at Jerusalem a joint episcopate of the English and Prussian Churches was made the occasion for a fierce anti-Lutheran demonstration; and even the admission of a Lutheran kinsman of the royal family as godfather to one of the royal children was denounced in a manner deeply offensive to the consort of Prince Albert. The very name, Protestant, so dear to the heart of the ordinary Englishman, was first dropped and at last anathematized. Gradually, and after a period of coy hesitation, the feelers of the party began to extend themselves with unmistakable lovingness towards Rome. With mediæval opinions the art of the Middle Ages was revived; the Oxford Architectural Society was the chief organ of the revival; and England as well as the Continent, and even more than the Continent, was covered with new or restored churches in the Gothic style, the monuments of this singular back-stream of sentiment, though the style stands on its own merits in an artistic point of view. Political conservatism was too much a thing of expediency and of the present; the alliance with it was broken; its chief, Sir Robert Peel, a stanch Protestant, a man in whom duty reigned without enthusiasm, who had no objection to political co-operation with Dissenters, and who sedulously conciliated in the interest of his party the science and literature of the age, became the object of a hatred which he partly returned. A tone was adopted of lofty superiority to all political alliances, not without a touch, on the part of some of the more thoroughgoing, of sympathy with radicalism and O'Connell and of *L'avenir vaut bien le passé*. The movement however gave birth to a little political party of its own, called Young England, which consisted mainly of young men of quality, who expected the regeneration of society through the restored ascendency of their

order in conjunction with the Church of the Middle Ages, wore white waistcoats, affected breakfast-parties where they talked about the condition-of-England question, delighted in mediæval nomenclature, and sang, —

> "Let wealth and commerce, laws and learning, die,
> But spare, O spare our old nobility."

In Parliament the Young-Englanders formed a *Fronde* always hostile to Sir Robert Peel, whom they accused of not corresponding to their mediæval ideal, and whom they assailed in the rear in a fashion which, as they had been sent up by their constituents to support him, did not always remind the public of Bayard. The organization was appropriated and its wires were pulled by Mr. Disraeli, who thus wrote the first chapter of his "Struggles and Triumphs," and who probably looks back upon Young England with much the same feelings with which Mr. Barnum, in the hour of pensive reflection, looks back upon Washington's Nurse.

The regular organ of the party was the serial called "Tracts for the Times," whence they were named the Tractarians, the title of the publication denoting the character of the movement as a reaction against the liberalism of the day. The leader, whose personal character and conceptions were deeply impressed on the party almost from the outset, was John Henry Newman, a Fellow of Oriel College. His countenance, the expression of his keen and subtle though not robust intellect, his extreme spiritual sensibility, and his monastic austerity, will not easily fade from the memory of any Oxford man of that day. "If I must submit my reason to mysteries, it is not much matter whether it is a mystery more or a mystery less; the main difficulty is to believe at all; the main difficulty to an inquirer is firmly to hold that there is a living God, — in spite of the darkness which surrounds him, the creator, witness, and judge of men!" * In these words Dr. Newman has written his own history and that of Tractarianism. To a mind excessively sceptical, wanting alike the decision to grasp the best-proved truths and the patience to wait for solutions, he united strong spiritual emotions and aspirations, and an intense craving for a religious

* Discourse addressed to Mixed Congregations, p. 290.

faith. It is a combination which reminds us of Pascal; and Pascal himself is hardly a greater name. Unlike his brother Francis, John Henry Newman was endowed with a powerful imagination, which enabled him intensely to realize, and to present vividly and with all the charms of poetry to others, the ideal of the mediæval Church. For a monk, and from the ascetic point of view, he had both wonderful insight into human nature and wonderful power of influencing men. His Oxford training had been unscientific; but he had deeply studied Aristotle and Plato, especially Aristotle, whose influence on his writings gives them a certain scholastic character, though without anything of scholastic pedantry or dryness. His style, by its ease, grace, simplicity, and freshness, made an epoch in English literature; and the structure of his sermons is like that of a perfect piece of music, of which they often remind us at their close. Those sermons preached in Saint Mary's Church, of which he was the vicar, to an eager crowd of youthful disciples, were far more than any "Tracts for the Times" the means of propagating Tractarian opinions. They were delivered in a manner impressive, though monotonous, without action or emphasis, forming as marked a contrast as possible to that of the popular preacher, whose rhetoric the language of the sermons as pointedly eschewed. To eloquence was added irony, of which everything earthy and respectable was the butt, and which in its delicacy and urbanity at least equalled the irony of the "Provincial Letters"; though since his conversion to Rome a strange change has, in this respect, come over Dr. Newman's style, and he sometimes sinks far below his former self, to virulence, and even to coarseness. May it be said, without bringing down another Apologia, that though his sincerity is unquestionable, and his aspirations are the highest, the structure of his mind is such that it seeks first that which is good, and in the second place that which is true? All who know his writings will allow that his intellect is the handmaid of his moral prepossessions, and that in that service it scruples at no sophistry, no rhetorical artifice, no manipulation or fallacious coloring of facts. A fugitive from scepticism to system, he flings himself heart and soul into the system in which he finds himself, be it the Anglican or the Catholic, —

a mystery more or a mystery less is nothing, when you are once in. Unable to believe on natural evidence in a God of reason and justice, he does not shrink from presenting in the broadest manner the arbitrary God of his ecclesiastical faith, — a God whose judgments are no more bound by justice than the lot which decimates mutineers; who, when a man is in other respects fit for salvation, may or may not send, at the last, a priest to give him the absolution, without which he will go to everlasting fire.* He rhetorically revels in the conception of one who has to all appearances done his duty and passed through life with honor, doomed to undying torment in hell for want of the ecclesiastical requisites of salvation, while on earth friends are saying kind things of the memory of the departed.† He so throws himself into the part of a priest as to say: "Come unto *us*, ye that labor and are heavy laden, and ye shall find rest to your souls." He can work himself up, though not without visible effort, to declare his belief in the Holy Coat of Treves, the winking Madonna, the liquefaction of the blood of Saint Januarius; and can outvie Ultramontanism itself in proclaiming the glories of Mary, showing all the time that he is conscious of the gradual growth of that myth. Dr. Newman's chief associates were Dr. Pusey, to whom his academical rank as Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church gave perhaps rather more prominence than he would otherwise have had, and Mr. Keble, whom everybody knows perfectly through his "Christian Year." Dr. Manning, already a Roman hierarch, Francis Faber, a religious sentimentalist of remarkable attractiveness and weakness, Mr. Ward, a dialectician of singular power, but, if we may trust his own language, of little learning, were also well-known names; and Mr. Hurrell Froude, having died early, was exalted, by affectionate paradox, to a high place among the originators of a movement of which his Diary remarkably displays the moral and intellectual effects. A Nestor, and a link to the past, was found for the party in Dr. Routh, the president of Magdalen College, who died in his hundredth year, having spent his life in studying the Fathers when they were studied by nobody

* Discourses, p. 33.

† Discourses, p. 48.

else; but it would have been difficult to get this Nestor in any sense to leave his ship.

Nobody has ever written a true autobiography, except, perhaps Rousseau, to whose vanity the most humiliating self-exposure was a pleasure. Dr. Newman's autobiography, though of course perfectly honest, is not true. The picture which it presents, and which no doubt the writer presents to himself, may be partly corrected by reference to "Loss and Gain," a tale with an autobiographical element, published by Dr. Newman immediately after his secession, from which we should gather that his reverence for the fogyism of the Establishment and its gentleman bishops was not quite so deep, nor his pang in parting from them quite so bitter, as in the "Apologia" he persuades himself that it was. There was more than he now thinks there was of party organization and party purpose, more systematic exertion of personal influence by the leader. His own sermon on "Personal Influence as a Means of Propagating the Truth" was felt to have a peculiar significance at the time. His followers obeyed his word on the day of battle. Nor did he neglect any fair advantage of war; he threw his spell for a while even over the powers that ruled the London "Times," though only, when he needed help, to have his head thrust under water by his ally. Proselytism was actively carried on among the students, not so much, perhaps, by the chief as by the lieutenants, who plied their chief's argument of All or Nothing, an Infallible Church or No God, with great effect both ways. Here was wrecked, or at least shattered, the mind of Arthur Clough, Arnold's favorite pupil, and the most promising among the Oxford youth of his day, who, pounced upon by the proselytizers, and overstrained with doubts and perplexities before his hour, though he escaped the immediate snare, went forth into life with the spring of his nature broken, a melancholy and almost hopeless craver after truth. But more than any proselytism, the ideal of a Catholic Church which Dr. Newman's genius had created, and the religious philosophy which he taught, drew to him the hearts of the young, who had known no church but the Establishment, no religious philosophy but "High and Dry" Anglicanism or uncultivated Evangelicism. It must also be confessed that the vulgar and

shallow part of Liberalism, with its self-complacent enlightenment, its gas, and its railroads, its apocalypse of stock-jobbers and contractors, did naturally incline many deep hearts, as well as many young hearts, to the side of reaction.

The principle of church authority once embraced, the path on which the Tractarian leaders walked was logically plain and short; and no domestic impediment to logical progress clung round the knees of Oxford monks. Soon, to keep any terms with the bulk of clerical, much more of national opinion, they were compelled to resort to "economy," that is, partial concealment of their real opinions, while, to meet the difficulties of the Calvinistic Articles, a system of "non-natural interpretation" was promulgated by Dr. Newman himself, in the famous Tract 90. It was impossible that these practices, together with the general exigencies of an equivocal position, and the self-perversion necessary in order to force a mind educated in Protestantism to accept the mythology of the Middle Ages, could fail to tell on the intellectual integrity of the party, though their honesty of purpose was beyond impeachment. But in spite of economy and non-natural interpretations, the crisis arrived. To Dr. Newman, probably, it was not welcome; he was probably looking forward to many years of useful and, if intellectual command is pleasant, not unpleasant leadership where he was; but it arrived. The pace had for some time been too great, not only for many of the followers, but for some of the original leaders, such as Mr. Sewell and Mr. Palmer. Tract 90 raised not only a storm without, but misgivings and backslidings within. Matters were brought to a decisive issue by Mr. Ward, who exultingly proclaimed that numbers of Anglican clergymen "were embracing the whole cycle of Roman doctrine." The Oxford authorities, who had long been in arms against the movement, and had driven Dr. Newman from St. Mary's pulpit to a little monastery which he built for himself and some of his disciples at the neighboring village of Littlemore, arraigned Mr. Ward's book before the University Convocation, by which it was condemned, and its author deprived of his degree. This sentence in itself would not have been fatal; but the movement had been brought suddenly to a head: an ambiguous position was no

longer tenable; the mass of the party, favored by obscurity, stopped short, with the usual resolution of Englishmen brought logically to a leap which they are practically determined not to take, while their leader, in the full swing of motion Romeward, pressed by those who looked up to him for a decision, and at the same time, as the monastic leader of a party of married clergy, sitting rather loose in his saddle, was projected into the Church of Rome. Such, it is believed, is a true though rough account of his final step, which, in the "Apologia," it is rather difficult to understand. He took few with him, and those, though the flower of the party intellectually, mainly monks. Dr. Pusey held back; and there is something in his dictatorial air as the present leader of the party, which suggests that he would have felt no ordinary difficulty in throwing himself at the feet of a Roman priest. Keble held back; the reasons which he gave for doing so were weak to the verge of absurdity, being an application of the rule of probability as the practical guide of life to the sphere of religious principle, in which it has no place: he dreamed, it seems, of going into some limbo, neither Canterbury nor Rome, a strange termination of his long advocacy of visible church authority and ecclesiastical salvation; but he was not an Oxford monk, but a country clergyman, with ties and duties, and above all a married man. Marriage was and is the real impediment to secession on the part of numbers of Anglican clergymen. They may dally with the Roman doctrine of celibacy as they do with other Roman doctrines; but they shrink from putting away their wives and making their children beggars. In vain Dr. Newman published his "Development," a curious theory, which would leave the apostles almost without a creed, while it would open a boundless vista of accumulating dogma and mythology in the future. In vain he pressed the waverers still closer with his "Difficulties of Anglicanism." The difficulties of Anglicanism might be great: the difficulties of trampling on nature and affection were greater still.

It was said that Dr. Newman's intellect could not rest in Rome. It is in Rome alone that such an intellect can rest. It may be well believed that, the first glow of conversion over, the Rome in which he finds himself is not the Rome of his fancy.

He dreamed of the Catholic Church of the Middle Ages, with its still half-missionary character, with its real universality, with the freshness of its childlike faith, with its St. Agnes and Sir Galahad: he finds himself in the great political establishment of the Catholic monarchies, with its Jesuits, its Wisemans, its senile and formalized superstition. He wooed the church of Anselm, and he has wedded the church of Suarez. He finds himself now encompassed with Jesuit intrigues which disgust the noble nature of Montalembert and the integrity of his own high-minded friend Mr. Ffoulkes. His genius marks him for suspicion; his grand schemes of Catholic education are pearls cast before swine; mere tinkling cymbals and "Apostles of the Genteel" are raised by stupidity and coterie over his head; he is not only neglected, but ostracized. But he has barred the door against return. "The Church does not allow him [the convert] to reconsider the question of her own divine mission; because such inquiries, though the appointed means of entering her pale, are superseded on his entrance by the gift of a spiritual sight; — a gift which consumes doubt so utterly that henceforth it is not that he must not, but that he cannot entertain it, — cannot entertain it except by his own great culpability, and therefore must not because he cannot." Meantime let his friends remember that to this Church which is so ungrateful for his splendid services, which flings away a jewel richer than all her tribe, he has sacrificed, not reason only, but humanity. "All she [the Church] asks is an open field, and freedom to act. She asks no patronage from the civil power [except where she can get it]; in former times and places she has asked it, and, as Protestantism also, has availed herself of the civil sword. It is true she did so, because in certain times *it has been the acknowledged mode of acting, the most expeditious, and open to no just exception;* but her history shows that she needed it not, for she has extended and flourished without it." These are almost unpardonable words.

After a period of confusion and collapse, the party re-formed under Dr. Pusey. But these are the Epigoni. Dr. Pusey himself is a man, not only of austere piety, but of great patristic and Hebrew learning, marred by the fancied duty of treating irrationally and unhistorically everything that he deems sacred,

and firmly convinced, and always displaying his conviction, that his opponents are the enemies of God. As a preacher on moral subjects, his intensity of feeling and the evident earnestness of his desire to save souls make him very impressive, though his views of life and character are mediæval to the last degree. As a theologian he is obscurity itself, and but little charity is required to believe that the logical consequences of the Roman Catholic principles which he has embraced do not present themselves clearly to his mind. The leading feature of the movement in its present phase is Ritualism, for which John Henry Newman was too great much to care, as both he and those about him were too great to run into the feeble violence of the extreme Ritualists, to fling mere ordure on the memories of martyred Reformers, and to compare the memorial raised over their ashes to the pile of stones upon the grave of Achan. As in these days young men of intellect will not bind the Thirty-nine Articles round their necks, the intellectual calibre and influence of the Anglican clergy fall; and as they fall, Ritualism and Sacerdotalism naturally rise: it is a real source of danger to English civilization. The world has laughed enough at the Directorium Anglicanum, with its wonderful code of directions for putting on a bishop's gloves and its rules for burning spiders which fall into the Eucharistic cup. It is an instance, unique in history, of a superstition elaborated at noonday. Every one must feel that the performance is more operatic in a Ritualistic than in a Roman Catholic church, the entrance of the performers more pompous, the personal action of the priest more obtrusive; the effort is felt throughout of a counterfeit trying to force itself upon you as a reality. Apologies have been put forth for the system on purely æsthetic grounds, as a concession to the natural taste for church art and ceremonial, which is starved by the colder forms of worship. But no one can fail to see that the central object of Anglican Ritualism is the revival of the Eucharistic miracle, and with it of priestly ascendency; for once grant that the priest can perform this miracle, and that the miracle is essential to spiritual life, and the priest is master of the Church and of man.

Though the English have deposed and beheaded kings, they are a very patient people. A parish, containing perhaps a number of educated persons having intelligent convictions, is worshipping God after its ancestral fashion, when, upon the presentation of a patron over whose choice the parish has no control, down comes a young clergyman just ordained, and upon the strength of his own unfledged notions, which he styles the tradition of the Church, changes the worship from Protestant to Catholic, and begins elevating the Host, and himself with it. There is no remedy but a proceeding in the ecclesiastical courts, full of expense, difficulty, and scandal. Those who do not choose to be parties to the exhibition of a false miracle therefore have nothing for it but to leave their parish church. If any resistance is made, the Ritualistic organs cry out against "a tyrannical interference with our Christian liberty," — the Christian liberty of a young clergyman, fancying himself the Church, to change the religion of a parish. This is one of the points on which the commencement of a disruption may be expected to appear.

The use of the confessional is another leading part of the system, and Dr. Pusey is always endeavoring to drive people to resort to it by the most alarming intimations of the spread of that particular form of moral evil to which his school appropriates the name of impurity, and to which he assumes that the confessional has proved an effectual antidote in Italy, Spain, the Spanish colonies, and Austria. The hypothesis that auricular confession has always formed a part of the Anglican Church system — however indispensable to those who take their stand on immemorial and unbroken tradition — not being in accordance with fact, the practice, in the hands of the Anglican Ritualists, is surrounded by none of those regulative safeguards which surround it and at all events temper its evils in the church of which it is an established institution; and it is carried on by a marrying instead of a celibate clergy; for though the Ritualists talk about clerical celibacy and call it continence, no step towards its general adoption has yet been taken. An analogous remark may be made with regard to monasticism, which has also been resuscitated, as any one may see in the streets of Oxford, where the dresses of the nuns are

as conspicuous now, as, in the Middle Ages, amidst the throng of varied costumes, they were the reverse. In the Catholic Church, monasticism, being recognized, is placed under strict regulations, which are enforced by authoritative inspection; notwithstanding which, as the Saurin case proved, despotic power may sometimes be misused in the hands of a saintly abbess as well as in the hands of a pacha; but in the Anglican Church, being novel and unrecognized, it is placed under no regulations; nor, so far as is known, are the monasteries inspected, unless it be by the head of the party, who could scarcely be trusted to exercise a severe control over the proceedings of a favorite lady superior; so that, if human nature remains itself in those cloisters, there is at any rate nothing incredible in the accounts which have been published, of petty spiritual tyranny on the one side, and degradation on the other.

It is true that brotherhoods and sisterhoods, as organizations of those who have no special ties or business, for the general service of humanity may yet prove useful in many ways, provided that there are no vows, no dereliction of ordinary duties, no asceticism, no masquerading, no notion of making mendicants stepping-stones to heaven, no forgetfulness of the fact that, while mediæval superstition kissed the sores of humanity, modern science tries to heal them. And so it is natural to wish that art should minister to religion: art probably will not be itself again till it does minister to religion: our modern painters have the manual skill, but they have not the inspiring subjects of Fra Angelico and Raphael. Possibly even the confessional itself may remotely point to some antidote for the evils of extreme moral isolation. But in all these cases, unless the religion of the Middle Ages is that of the future (and it is here assumed that it belongs to an irrevocable past), things useful, perhaps essential, to humanity are being tainted by perversion to the purposes of sacerdotal ascendency and ecclesiastical reaction.

It is not difficult to enter into the feelings of the Ritualists, or to understand why they Romanize, and why they yet shrink from Rome. But a position more untenable was surely never held by any religious party. These teachers demand in the name of church authority the submission of our reason, and not

only of our reason, but of our moral sense; for our moral sense is contradicted by some of their favorite tenets as to the divine nature and government; and their attempts to produce a philosophy of the irrational on these subjects share the fate of attempts to produce a theory of irregular verbs. What, then, is the church in the name of which they speak, — Christendom? They are one of the most inconsiderable, as well as one of the youngest of its multitudinous sects. The church of the episcopate and the apostolical succession? By the Catholics and the Greeks, constituting together an overwhelming majority of that church, they are repudiated and condemned as schismatics and heretics; and the Catholic Church, when they appeal to her consideration on the ground of doctrinal affinity, only tells them that the nearer they are to the truth, and the clearer is their view of it, the more dangerous is their continuance on the outside of the pale of salvation. Even in their own church they are but a party, a small party, and a novel party. For assuredly a more desperate task never was undertaken by any manipulator of facts than that of proving, otherwise than by some inner light or religious sense acting independently of history, that the church of Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, and Hooker was Ritualist from the beginning. If it was, it is difficult to say which were the greater criminals, — those who burnt the Reformers, or the Reformers who allowed themselves to be burnt? Can Dr. Pusey think that a physical coward like Cranmer went to the stake for nothing but the hair-splittings which now divide the Doctor and his party from Rome? The Reformation of Edward VI. was accomplished with the active aid and partly under the authority of foreign Reformers; and the Church remained in full communion with the Protestant churches on the Continent till at least the middle of the reign of James I. Hooker combats the tyrannical claims of Presbyterianism, not on the ground of the apostolical succession, but on Liberal grounds; and there is not a trace to be found in him of the Ritualistic theory of the position of the Church of England. In the reign of James I., England sent representatives to the Calvinist and Presbyterian Synod of Dort. Whitgift was an ultra Calvinist, and so of course was Abbot. Clarendon tells us that it was by Laud's order that the com-

munion-table was removed from the body of the church, where it had stood till that time, and placed altar-wise at the east end, and that the innovation gave great offence; the clearest possible proof that the High Church doctrine of the sacrament had not before been received, and that the most essential note of a true church, according to the Ritualists, had consequently been wanting. It is needless to ask whether the Established Church of England in the last century was Protestant or Catholic. The law of the land applied to her; her hierarchy, clergy, and laity alike gloried in, and her daughter church in this country received from her, the name of Protestant, from which, as the note of heresy and heretical associations, every Ritualist starts with abhorrence. As the rubric on the Communion calls the adoration of the elements "idolatry," it is not easy to maintain that Ritualism has even verbally lurked in the formularies; but suppose it had, the witness of a church, to be authoritative, must be conscious, not like the witness of the book-shelf on which the formularies repose. The Ritualists, under their former name of Tractarians, found it necessary to creep to their mark under cover of economy and non-natural senses; and surely that must be a strange Infallibility which does not know the true meaning of her own ordinances, and to whom it is necessary to break the truth with extreme caution lest she should receive it with execration. But, more than this, the opinions of the Ritualists themselves, instead of being received from authority or by tradition, have manifestly been formed gradually, with hesitation, and by a process which, though it happens to lead to the abnegation of private judgment, was itself as much one of private judgment as any that ever passed in the mind of Renan or of Strauss. The fact is marked by the alteration which it has been necessary to make in a verse of the Christian Year, relating to the doctrine of the Eucharist; and which is awkwardly covered by suggesting that, in the original version, — "not in the hands but in the heart," — "only" was to be understood after "not"; the poem in which the verse occurs being that on the Gunpowder Plot, and directly pointed against Roman Catholic error. Dr. Pusey's position is in fact simply a halt, logically unaccountable, on the road by which — he and Dr. Newman both setting out

from the Protestantism of the Establishment — Dr. Newman has reached Rome.

On the side towards Rome the position of the Ritualists is conspicuously weak. Here their Butlerian doctrine of probability tells heavily against them. The Church of Rome denies that they are a true church; but they do not deny that the Church of Rome is a true church: on the contrary, they show by their respectful bearing towards her and their loving approaches to her that they think her a better church than their own. Common prudence then dictates the choice of that church which both parties allow to be a true church and capable of assuring the salvation of her members. Dr. Pusey indeed undertakes to warrant that Providence has great things in store for the Church of England; but Archbishop Manning may reply with some force that Dr. Pusey at all events is not personally infallible, and that if he happens in this instance to be mistaken, his followers will awake to a sense of his fallibility in the place of lost souls. It is not surprising that individual conversions are continually taking place, so that by this time Dr. Pusey is probably able to count a goodly host of his former disciples in what he calls "another portion of the vineyard." "He is like the church-bell," said Pio Nono, "which rings people into church, though it does not come in itself." It is said that he once reproached a Catholic priest with having seduced some young Anglicans from their allegiance to their mother church. "*You* taught them to use Catholic books of devotion," replied the priest, "and by using those books they have found grace." Without warranting the truth of the anecdote, it may be cited as appositely illustrating the absurdity of attempting, when a religion is really fed from Roman sources, to establish it in permanent independence of Rome.

In the disquietude of conscious weakness, overtures of union and alliance are made to all ecclesiastical powers, except the Protestant churches of the Continent, which are steadily treated as unclean. The old schemes of the Caroline Bishops and of the diplomatic Gallicans of the Regency, whose character and policy Dr. Pusey sees in a very false light, are revived. To Rome, which is already receiving the submission of the party

by driblets, formal union with it is proposed on the condition that she — with whom it is not a policy, but a vital necessity and an imperative instinct, to make no concessions, never to admit the shadow of a change — will, to save the honor of Anglicanism, disown the doctrine, which for some time past she has been led by manifest exigencies to exalt and strengthen, of the infallibility of the Pope; and proclaim to the peasantry of Calabria and Spain that the excessive worship of the Virgin is a mistake. An appeal is made to the Church of Russia, the Greek Church as it is called; which, cased in the thick ice of its nationality, its imperialism, its ignorance, and its antediluvian creed and system, scarcely hears the sound; and which, if it did, would never consent to accept the Catholic and Anglican dogma as to the procession of the third person of the Trinity, for rejecting which it is consigned by the Ritualists, as often as they say their favorite Athanasian creed, to everlasting perdition. An appeal is made to Gallicanism; which, being dead, returns no reply. The Wesleyans, who in the hour of strength would probably be treated as mere schismatics, and invited to enter the Church by penance, are told, in effect, that if they will allow their ministers to be reordained by Anglican bishops, and give up their churches to be used as district chapels, they may be allowed to become Anglicans without further humiliation; and the response is such as might be expected from a community so respectable, so wealthy, and so powerful as to form of itself almost a secondary Establishment. The Evangelicals, whom the Ritualists were persecuting but yesterday in the person of Mr. Gorham, are affectionately pressed, as Christian brethren, at least to take part with them in persecuting Mr. Voysey and Dr. Temple; but the Evangelicals, partly from a regard for principle, which does them honor, partly perhaps because they foresee what would happen if they were to be ultimately left alone with the Ritualists, prefer to persecute Mr. Voysey and Dr. Temple by themselves. Humanity — Europe, at least — may be thankful that a union of all the great sacerdotal and political churches for the purpose of crushing liberty of thought is a matter difficult to arrange.

Dr. Pusey wishes to be united to Rome, but he does not wish to submit to her; he aspires to negotiate a union as power with

power, and on the principle of give and take. The notion of settling forever the creed of the human race, by a negotiation between himself and some plenipotentiary of Pio Nono and Cardinal Antonelli, does not strike his earnest mind as at all grotesque. In his "Eirenicon" he has two objects in view, — to make overtures to Rome, and at the same time to prevent his partisans from rushing into her arms, — to draw his bark close to that of Peter, and prevent his crew from jumping on board; and the result is a curious mixture of courtship and denunciation, caresses and hard blows. On the one hand, the writer states or clearly implies his readiness to assent to all that is most essential in Roman doctrine and practice, just sniffing, so to speak, at the practice of persecution, but — it is important to observe — showing no moral repugnance to it; on the other hand, he hammers like a Protestant iconoclast at the ultramontane theory of Papal infallibility and the last developments of mariolatry, without, however, attempting to state by what criterion, having once left reason behind, — as he must have done to arrive at his own position, — he distinguishes the more irrational from the less. "You discharge your olive-branch at us," said Dr. Newman, "as it were from a catapult." And he returned the heavy projectile, a polished shaft from Apollo's bow. Rome — "St. Bernard de Brutis" and all — remains as she was, and secessions to her from Ritualism are still announced.

It would be difficult to form an estimate of the numbers of the Ritualist party. Those of the congregations in Ritualist churches are swelled, as any one who attends the services may easily see, by crowds attracted by the pageantry and music, or by mere curiosity; sometimes even by less religious motives; for in London these churches are apt to take the place of the theatres on Sunday evening. Among the clergy the party is considerable, and probably on the increase, and for the reason already mentioned, — the effect of theological perplexities, which deter active and independent minds from taking orders, on the intellectual character of the profession. Of course, if its numbers are increased by such an agency, its intellectual force and influence are proportionally small. Mr. Liddon has acquired great and deserved celebrity as a popular

preacher rather after the French model, that is, with a highly rhetorical style and a very vehement delivery; crowds go to hear and admire him; but where there is no security for independent thought, where in fact you may be sure that independent thought has been excluded as a criminal indulgence of the reason on points settled forever by faith, seekers after truth turn an inattentive ear; and it is easy to take the measure of the influence ultimately exerted on conviction by mere pulpit eloquence, in an age when inquiry is growing always more scientific. Among the laity, Ritualism appeals with most success to the rich, and especially to ladies of wealth and rank, several of whom have found their way through it to the Church of Rome; all which is the history of the Laudian movement over again. With regard to the laity as with regard to the clergy, it may safely be said that the number of Ritualists remarkable for high intellect or high education is very small; so small as to suggest that an improvement of university and female education would almost extinguish the tendency in its source. A few from the middle classes are enlisted as minor performers in the Ritualistic services; and perhaps a few more are attracted by those appeals to the taste, and to æsthetic emotion, in which, it should always be remembered, Ritualism is strong, though it makes use of them with a view to an ulterior, and, in the opinion of its opponents, a bad, object; for the ritual of the upper chamber or of the wilderness will not satisfy ordinary humanity now that the primal enthusiasm which gathered worshippers in the upper chamber or in the wilderness is gone. If any proselytes are found among the laboring poor, they are made mainly by the efforts of the sisterhoods (whose influence again it is instructive to mark), and are proselytes rather of gratitude than of conviction. For the mass of the poor there is nothing to bridge over the gulf which ages of Protestantism have fixed between their hearts and Popery; they are little touched by æsthetic influences, which can scarcely be felt without some intellectual preparation; and things which attract the religious *dilettante* have little attraction for the ploughman, who is rendered callous to them, perhaps raised above them, by daily contact with the hardest realities of life. Of course the ploughman knows

not the mental disturbances which drive those who have not learnt the duty of loyalty to truth in times of doubt, and of patient expectation of the solution which, if justice rules the world, is sure to present itself in the end, into Ritualism or beyond it, in quest of a refuge from the doubts which vex our age. This is the main, or rather the sole, intellectual source from which Ritualism is fed; and those who have once yielded to such an impulse, if not held back by other than intellectual ties, are sure in the end to find their way through any equivocal halting-place to Rome, the only authority ancient and imposing enough, and with sufficient pretence to the character of universality, to afford to harassed consciences the peace of intellectual death.

The third of the divergent elements which we have mentioned as tending to the disruption of the Established Church can scarcely be said to present itself in the form of a party: it has no organization, scarcely any coherence; no two of its members probably think exactly alike; it is united only for the purposes of a common defence against the assaults of its opponents. "Broad-Churchmen" is the name commonly applied to the clergymen of this section; but the designation is inadequate, the tendency to comprehension, though congenial to their principles, and indeed a necessary incident of their position, being by no means their essential characteristic. Their essential characteristic is far better expressed by the name *Rationalists*, though in the mouths of opponents that term has contracted associations so odious as to unfit it for the purposes of neutral description. No man, whatever his own sympathies or antipathies may be, if he has watched with an open mind the intellectual movements of his age, can fail to see that, while the Christian type of character remains almost unassailed in its perfection and universality,— while the principles of morality, individual and social, are still fundamentally Christian, and everything that can be designated as spiritual life is still traceable to a Christian source,— the conceptions formerly dominant with regard to Bible cosmogony and history, with regard to the authorship and nature of certain books, and with regard to the inspiration of the Bible as a whole, have been profoundly modified by the progress of science, of

philological criticism, and of the philosophy of history; and this in the minds of inquirers most religious as well as most learned, and on whom no suspicion can be cast of want of reverence for things sacred, or of hostility to Christianity as a rule of life. The scientific and historical evidences of the Christian religion, in a word, as traditionally received, have been gravely shaken, while the moral evidences hold their ground and still bind to the Christian communion the hearts of many whose intellects have rejected, or ceased to receive without questioning, the supernatural portion of the history and the greater part of the dogmatic creed. Of course the movement in some quarters has gone far beyond this: the science, the philosophy, the poetry, the general literature, the conversation of the age, are pervaded by a scepticism to which it is difficult to assign bounds, and which — as the influences which in the mass of men keep selfish interests and passions in subordination to the claims of the community, though they may not be identical with the hope of future rewards and the fear of future punishments, are, according to even the most advanced schools of philosophy, at present fundamentally religious — may well fill the political philosopher as well as the divine with the gravest apprehensions. But this article treats of parties and forces within the Church of England. Within the Church of England there is among the educated laity a large and daily increasing party, which has opened its eyes to the results of European inquiry and discussion; which bows no more either to church authority or to that of uncritical citation from an inspired Book; which demands of its spiritual guides that, without regard to dogma or tradition, they shall guide it, if they can, to truth, reconcile for it religion to science, and give it new assurance of its faith. These laymen stand before the ecclesiastical courts by the side of Bishop Colenso, or any other free inquirer of their church who may be attacked and threatened with expulsion, — not in sign of agreement with his particular conclusions, but in sign of their determination that inquiry must and shall be free. A certain number of the clergy share — probably, as their thoughts and studies led them professionally in that direction, and they would first feel practically the pressure of any religious doubt they antici-

pated — the desire of the laity ; though, of a body which every one who mixes in clerical society knows to be not inconsiderable in number, while it is pre-eminent in intellect, few venture, or, from the circumstances in which they are placed, can be expected to venture, to speak out.

An article appeared some time ago in the Quarterly Review, the pious object of which was to raise a mob against the Liberal clergy and expose them to ecclesiastical Lynch-law by identifying them with the irreverent, blasphemous, and sometimes sensual freethinkers of the last century. But the artfulness of insinuation by which the article was pervaded showed that the writer was himself, at least, partly conscious of its calumnious character. It is impossible that any body of men can be more reverent, farther removed from anything like a blasphemous tendency, or, to say the least, less open to any imputation of desiring to lower the standard of morality for themselves or others, than the clerical leaders of the party which was the object of attack. England knows no better examples of Christian duty, — no men whose lives have more commended Christianity to the mass of the people, who judge by practice and not by dogma, — than Mr. Maurice, Dr. Temple, Dr. Stanley, and Mr. Jowett. Nor has any one of the Essayists and Reviewers, nor any one who can fairly be associated with them, said or written anything so justly offensive to orthodoxy itself, — anything, if such words are to be used, so anti-Christian, — as the article which shortly afterwards, to meet the prevailing taste of the literary world, was published by the Quarterly itself, representing Christianity as derived from the Talmud, or from the sources of the Talmud, and as being a mere phase of Pharisaism.* The precursors of the Essayists and Reviewers, if they can be said to have had any, in the Church of England were Cudworth and the early Latitudinarians, whose deep study of ancient philosophy led them to assign to the moral elements of religion a great preponderance over the dogmatic, and thus virtually to subject faith to the moral test ; and it is

* The same writer is now proving that Mahometanism also is derived from the Talmud. Suppose the Talmud supplied the wood, whence came the fire? What are the modern Jews, who have been always feeding on the Talmud? Do they produce Mahomets, — not to say, St. Pauls?

remarkable that Dr. Hampden, in whose person the present movement commenced, was a great Oxford Aristotelian and Platonist, who, from the philosophic point of view, handled Byzantine dogmas with a freedom which, as has been already mentioned, brought down upon him the hostility of the High-Church party; though afterwards, having been made a bishop, he sank into the lowest depth of Establishmentarian orthodoxy, and, to make peace with his former assailants, was forward in anathematizing his old friends. It is doubtful whether Coleridge should be regarded as a precursor of the movement or as its originator. Though he is a strong pietist and an upholder of the Establishment, and though he generally comes to orthodox conclusions, he comes to them by a method which, if we may use the term under protest, is thoroughly rationalistic. By the very attempt to construct a religious philosophy, — an attempt made for the first time in the English Church by Coleridge, who is in fact almost the only theologian of that church in the proper sense of the term, — the paramount claims of reason and of the moral sense are implicitly acknowledged; and this is what constitutes the rationalist, at whatever conclusions he may happen to arrive. In Coleridge may be found that very theory of the providential education of the human race which forms the substance of the Essay of Dr. Temple. Of course it was not in the writings of Coleridge that such a theory appeared for the first time. Germany is the source of this and of much else in him, and the source, not only through him, but directly, of much in the new theology of England; that country, in which the independence of the Teutonic mind, debarred from politics hitherto by a group of petty despotisms under the protection of Austria, has found an outlet in free speculation, is the great school of criticism, and seems likely to become the mother of a second, as it was of the first, Reformation. "Germanizers," as well as "Rationalists," is a term of opprobrium applied to the Liberal clergy by their opponents; it appeals to the most insensate of all national prejudices, since assuredly Englishmen ought to exult in the intellectual achievements and in the growing ascendency of the great community of their race, — that community which places Alfred in its Walhalla. But English Liberalism, theological

as well as political, though in a less degree, draws a character of its own from the soil on which it grows. Nobody could mistake Dean Milman, Mr. Robertson, Dr. Temple, or even Mr. Jowett, for a German, though it would be obvious that each of them was indebted to German erudition. An intensely practical and political nation stamps on all its offspring a certain impress which even poets and metaphysicians do not escape.

Dean Milman's History of the Jews was perhaps the first work in which the Bible was treated historically and critically by an English Churchman; and accordingly it raised a storm, which, however, its author survived, ending his days, as Dean of St. Paul's, unmolested and an object of general respect. Bishop Thirlwall in his youth wrote a critical treatise of decidedly German character, which was, of course, fished up when, as a bishop, he took a reactionary line. But the present group of Liberals arose immediately out of the fermentation and disturbance of old beliefs caused by Tractarianism, which thus became, in a certain sense, the mother of an unbeloved progeny, — *matremque suus conterruit infans.* The names best known among them, on this side of the water at least, are Mr. Robertson, — whose merits were perhaps appreciated here before they were fully appreciated in his own country, — Dr. Stanley, Mr. Jowett, and Dr. Temple. There is probably nothing in Mr. Robertson's sermons which could be fixed upon as heterodox; but they are pervaded by an acknowledgment of the supremacy of reason and conscience, and at the same time by a recognition of virtue, even of Christian virtue, outside of the pale of dogmatic orthodoxy, outside of the pale of Christian profession; which are thoroughly rationalistic; and accordingly Mr. Robertson was regarded with suspicion and somewhat harassed by the orthodox party during his lifetime, though since his death the beauty of his writings and of the character embodied in them have drawn all Christians to them, and struck detraction dumb. In Dr. Stanley's writings again no specific heterodoxy will be found: he is in fact not a theologian, but a writer on ecclesiastical history; but both in his mode of treatment and in his range of sympathy the instinct of orthodoxy detects the hostile element; and instinct, as usual, is

in the right. From Mr. Jowett's writings specific propositions have been selected for condemnation by his opponents; but in this case also it is in the general spirit, in the subjection of mystery to reason, of the supernatural to historical scrutiny and natural explanation, that the grounds for alarm and anathema are really found. The great influence exercised by Mr. Jowett as a college tutor over his pupils makes him a special object of jealousy to the orthodox; though the hollowness of much of the opposition to him is betrayed by the fact that the college of which he is a tutor, and where the poison of his heresies is supposed to circulate, is by far the most in request of any college in the University. Dr. Temple is more a man of action than of speculation: not only by his own success as an educator, but by his great services to education in every department, and by his fearless advocacy of political and social justice, he has probably done more than any other living man to reconcile the people to the Establishment. His paper in "Essays and Reviews" had been preached as a sermon before the University of Oxford without stirring in the slightest degree the theological susceptibilities of that most orthodox body; and his subsequently published volume of sermons is confessedly immaculate in point of doctrine; but his general bearing makes it manifest that if placed in the dilemma, he would prefer reason and the moral sense to anything, to the letter of the Bible as well as to the authority of the Church; so that in his case, once more, the instinct of orthodoxy is right. Mr. Maurice, who is also revered and beloved as a social reformer, is a personal disciple of Coleridge, like whom he is sometimes involved in a darkness which only to his most assiduous readers appears excess of light. His theology was sufficiently liberal to lead to his ejection from a professorship at a Church-of-England college, though he is now Professor of Moral Philosophy at the University of Cambridge.

The first great crisis in the advance of the new theology was the publication of "Essays and Reviews." The contents of the several Essays in that book were a matter of minor importance. It has already been said that Dr. Temple's had no mischief in it; and that of Mr. Pattison on the theologians of the last century would unquestionably have passed without re-

mark if it had appeared as an article in the Quarterly Review. Some of the others were more alarming; though, as was proved in the sequel, none of them went beyond the limits of the ecclesiastical law. What created all the panic and uproar was the combination, which seemed plainly to indicate the existence of an organized party; and the Preface, which, though quietly and cautiously worded, announced to the terrified ears of the orthodox, as plainly as the clang of a trumpet sounding the charge, that religious questions were about to be handled in a free spirit, and that Neology dared Orthodoxy to battle. Men seldom contribute the best fruits of their brains to these joint-stock volumes, in which merit and responsibility are alike partly lost; and if the bishops and clergy could possibly have kept quiet, "Essays and Reviews" might have fallen still-born from the press. But it was not possible that the bishops and clergy should keep quiet when such a standard had been raised in their own camp; and so lustily did they cry out that, in a few weeks, the book was rushing through edition after edition, and was eagerly devoured from one end of the country to the other. It must have met the Archbishop of Canterbury's eye in every railroad-car in which he travelled, in every house at which he called, in every bookstore into which he looked. A terrible revelation of the thoughts and appetites which were lurking beneath the surface of conventional belief in the mind of the nation! The effect of the book was very great: it was very great because all the world was persuaded that if men in the position of these clergymen had said so much, there must be a great deal more which they would say if they dared.

Litigation in the ecclesiastical courts followed, the result of which was a clear revelation of the fact that the Church of England has in her Articles no declaration on the subject of inspiration; nor even respecting the character or authenticity of any book of Scripture, beyond an enumeration of the books of the canon, and the negative assertion, directed against the Roman doctrine of tradition, that nothing which cannot be proved out of those books is necessary to salvation. No doubt the doctrine of inspiration, not having been disputed by the Catholics or by the sectaries of the sixteenth century, was taken

for granted; and any one who had held the language of some of the Essayists and Reviewers, in the days when the Articles were framed, would have been handed over, like the Anabaptists, to the secular arm. But law is law; and a breach was thus opened in the ramparts, through which legions of Neologians might march in.

A thrill of still more intense alarm followed the announcement that a book going beyond "Essays and Reviews" in the same direction was about to be published by an Anglican bishop. He proved to be only a colonial bishop; but in other respects the book fulfilled the worst anticipations. It impugned not only the historical accuracy, but the morality of the Old Testament, and this with all the force of a man giving utterance to his convictions reluctantly, in spite of all the inducements and restraints of his position, and under the severest penalties, in obedience to the unquenchable voice of conscience. In the opinion of the educated laity, the book required an answer; but the only answer which it received from the bishops, from the clergy, from Convocation, or even from the Panan-glican Synod, that Ecumenical Council in the Vatican of Lambeth, was anathema, — in an age and nation so far emancipated from ecclesiastical authority, powerless, or rather suicidal. And yet there was an answer to Dr. Colenso, which, if it would not have satisfied Dr. Pusey or Lord Shaftesbury, would have partly tranquillized many minds. Dr. Colenso's training had been mainly, if not exclusively, mathematical, of which the general current of his criticism affords singular, not to say grotesque, proof. To the study of history and historical philosophy he had evidently not given much attention. He would otherwise have been aware that numerical errors and exaggerations, however great, in early chroniclers are not considered by critics to affect the general credibility of the narrative to anything like the extent to which he assumes that they do, — otherwise there would be an end to belief in Marathon and Salamis, or in the First Crusade. What is of more importance, he would have known that it was necessary to study morality historically, and to judge of the moral character of the Mosaic or any other legislation by reference to the stage of development which society had reached at the time. Slavery, domestic despotism,

the right of private revenge, the right of asylum, an international state of war, were not created by the Mosaic law; they were, like tribal ownership of land, existing institutions of the tribes, and were modified by the Mosaic law, — as will be found, — in the interest of morality and civilization. The same thing may be said with regard to the sacrifices, both propitiatory and expiatory, and that religion of ceremonies and observances which was the only worship possible at the period, and which the Mosaic law, so far as it took effect, rendered more spiritual, and, had it taken full effect, would have rendered beyond comparison the most spiritual of all the religions of the ancient world. But such an answer would itself have been Rationalism.

One strenuous and memorable attempt has been made, amidst all the *bruta fulmina* of ecclesiastical denunciation, to arrest by force of argument the progress of this free criticism, and to compel reason and the moral sense to accept with unquestioning submission the letter of the Bible as presented to them by the Church. The recent controversy between Mr. John Stuart Mill and Dr. Mansel has called attention again to Dr. Mansel's Bampton Lectures, on the Limits of Religious Thought, — a work of which, brilliant as was its success, its author would probably be glad to hear no more. An acute and learned metaphysician, a fellow of a High Tory college, and the leader of the Tory party at Oxford, — in which capacity he had animated and directed all the attacks on Mr. Gladstone, — he had, perhaps, the interests of orthodoxy and Toryism both at heart when he undertook to demonstrate metaphysically that the reason of man could know nothing of the nature of God, and consequently was incompetent to form any opinion as to the morality of an alleged revelation, which, whether consonant or repugnant to our moral sense, must be accepted without questioning, just as it fell from heaven. Not being familiar, as it appears, with the philosophy of history, he knew no other way of untying the knot of the Old Testament difficulty than by thus cutting it with the metaphysical sword. No doubt, in proving that we were inherently incapable of knowing anything about God, Dr. Mansel intended to reserve our capacity of knowing that God was all-powerful, and that He would con-

demn to eternal punishment those who did not believe in revelation. But as Mr. Mill has pointed out, this reservation is utterly illogical; and the net result is that the champion of orthodoxy has demonstrated that God is totally incognizable by our faculties, and that therefore, to us, he has no existence. We are landed, as Mr. Maurice said at the time, in orthodox atheism. It is probable that, even before Dr. Mansel reached the end of his course of lectures, he had begun to be conscious of the bourne towards which he was tending; for in the latter part of the course there are symptons of a disposition to hedge. He must have been thoroughly awakened to the truth when he saw his reasoning adopted by Mr. Herbert Spencer as satisfactorily demonstrating that beyond physical phenomena there lay nothing but the unknown. Meantime it was proclaimed, first in Oxford, then throughout the Establishment, that a second Butler had arisen, who had confounded all the enemies of the faith by making Reason put out her own light; and bishops and clergy, hailing the Bampton Lectures with grateful acclamations, gave, to all who had eyes to see, fatal and decisive proof of the hollowness of the current theology, whose doctors could thus unwittingly welcome as a Heaven-sent reinforcement of the evidences of religion a demonstration of the impossibility of believing in a God.

It is needless to say that in the case of each of these parties the extremes shade off into a neutral or undecided mass, to which a large proportion of the clergy of the Establishment belong. But opinion and spiritual activity, as fast as they develop, take one of these three divergent, or rather, perhaps, it should now be said, one of the two last-mentioned directions; and it is difficult to see how the Ritualist can ever recede from the ground, which he has taken up, of Church authority and Sacramentalism; or the Rationalist, from the ground of reason; or how, neither receding, they can long both remain within the same pale.

As soon as the different parties became conscious of their mutual antagonism, a struggle commenced between them in the ecclesiastical courts, the High-Churchmen attempting to eject the Evangelicals, the Evangelicals attempting to eject the Ritualists, and both together attempting to eject the Neo-

logians, from the Establishment. Then was exhibited, in an age and among a people already sufficiently mistrustful of theology, the spectacle of theologians haling each other to the bar of justice; of legal tribunals convoked to decide questions of opinion and conscience; of forensic battles between hired counsel about the most sacred mysteries of the faith; of the fate of the Church hanging apparently on the verdict of irreligious men of the world, — sometimes of men whose character stood low even among their own class; of the ghosts of Byzantine and mediæval theosophy stalking and coming into court at noonday amidst the jeers of the cynic and the sighs of the devout. No doubt they were not, properly speaking, questions of theology, but questions of law and of the title to certain endowments, which were being debated; but the moral effect upon the people could not be limited by the technical character of the proceedings. Privy Councillors sat, as Carlyle says, like Roman augurs, debating with iron gravity "prevenient grace, supervenient moonshine, and the color of the bishop's nightmare," — debating now the subtleties of baptismal regeneration, now whether the communion-table might be of stone or whether it could only be of wood; whether it might be fixed or whether it must be movable; whether candles might be placed upon it, and whether they might be lighted; what was the exact amount of genuflection and posture-making which might be permitted to the priest at the celebration of the Eucharist; — this under the eyes of a crowd of secularists and sceptics, and when the evidences of the most fundamental doctrines of religion required restatement to commend them again even to the most willing minds; when men by nature religious were doubting the providential government of the universe and the immortality of the soul.

To a great extent the arguments turned, and the decision depended, on mere accidents of language; the framers of the articles and formularies having provided as well as they could for the exigencies of their own time, and having hastened to put the roof on their somewhat motley edifice, without attempting to forecast the controversies of the nineteenth century. The old lawyers and politicians before whom, in the last resort, the questions came, gave decisions in fact rather

political than judicial, leaning to indulgence and comprehension, with a view to averting secession and providing that the institution, so inseparable a portion of the social fabric in their eyes, should if possible at least last their time. This they were enabled to do in cases of ritual by the uncertainty of ecclesiastical antiquities, and in cases of doctrine by the looseness of theological language even in controversial works. "The passage," exclaimed the counsel for the prosecution, "must have this meaning, my Lords, or none." "I am no theologian, Mr. ——," replied one of the judges, — "I am no theologian; — but may not the passage have no meaning?" First the Evangelicals were attacked in the person of Mr. Gorham, whom the High-Church Bishop of Exeter refused to induct to a living, for denying the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. A great secession of High-Churchmen from the Establishment was threatened if sentence were not given against Mr. Gorham; but when, by means of a little manipulation of language, the case was decided in his favor, the secession was adjourned. The Protestants retorted by the prosecution of Mr. Liddell and other Ritualists for introducing Popish ceremonial; and here it was managed that both parties should be able to claim a victory; it being decided, among other things, that candles might be placed upon the altar, but that they might not be lighted. Litigation on this subject has continued, and the other day a legal victory was gained by the anti-Ritualists over Mr. Machonochie; though, as might have been expected, without much practical result, the Ritualists complying literally with the judgment of the court, but managing to continue the use of forms sufficiently suggestive of the Eucharistic miracle. Meantime the gauntlet thrown down in the preface of "Essays and Reviews" was taken up, and the authors of the more heretical of those papers were prosecuted by a combination of the orthodox parties, whose fangs however they escaped, inflicting on their assailants, by the way, the fatal blow to which we have already referred. The Colenso case, as it came before the Privy Council, was not one of doctrine, but one of jurisdiction, raised by the claim of the Bishop of Capetown, as Metropolitan of the Church in South Africa, to exercise ecclesiastical discipline over the Bishop of Natal; and the

practical result is that the Bishop of Natal holds his ground, supported apparently by the colonists, who are always on the side of the Crown, and goes on from volume to volume, and from heresy to heresy, while the Bishop of Capetown fulminates in vain. Dr. Pusey behaved through these proceedings like a man above reason. He first dragged his opponents before the courts, and, when they were acquitted, denied the authority of the tribunal. As a member of the Oxford Council, he actually put his veto on a motion to confer an honorary degree on Lord Kingsdown, because Lord Kingsdown, as a member of the Privy Council, had concurred in a judgment of the court adverse to Dr. Pusey's party. In the clerical convocation of the University of Oxford, Dr. Pusey had it all his own way; and that body, at his dictation, persistently withheld from Mr. Jowett, as Professor of Greek, an augmentation of his stipend which he would otherwise have received in common with some of his brother professors, as a punishment for his heresies as a theologian. Strangers came to the discussion, which was more than once repeated, to look perhaps for the last time on what survived of the Middle Ages. The Convocation at Westminster has also condemned and anathematized; and has thereby enabled the world to take the measure of the influence exerted by Church authority in the present day. So far nothing decisive had taken place; but now two things have taken place, either of which may be the beginning of the end. The Rev. Mr. Voysey, a clergyman of the Neological school, has been condemned, and deprived of his benefice, for opinions which, though he appears to have expressed them with extreme violence, are probably not confined to himself, — an event which may force the Neologians generally to reflect upon their own position. At the same time Dr. Temple, with the condemnatory sentence of Convocation still upon him as one of the authors of "Essays and Reviews," has been made a bishop; and Dr. Pusey, foiled in his attempt to prevent the appointment, declares for the separation of the Church from the State.

GOLDWIN SMITH.

ART. VI. — 1. *The Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury to Congress.* Washington, December 6, 1869.
2. *The Annual Report of the Comptroller of the Currency.* Washington, November 10, 1869.

THE maxim that "finance is nothing if not scientific" is hardly suited for popular acceptance. The great mass of men, whether engaged in trade or not, have but little faith in the existence of any principles or laws governing the movements of the currency and monetary affairs. They look upon inflations and contractions, upon stagnations and crises, as the results of the blind working of some unseen power; and when the tempest overtakes them in its course, they are inclined, like the Mahometan, to bow their heads, with the exclamation, "Allah is great!" If the policy pursued by Mr. Boutwell results in success, the popular belief, or want of belief, will receive a fresh justification. In fact, the conduct of the finances of the United States for the last nine years has been in open defiance of all the laws which had come to be regarded as the axioms of political economy. All Europe has looked on in wonder at the spectacle of a nation which, setting at naught all established traditions, has yet successfully concluded a civil war on the largest scale, and during five years subsequently has met with no serious financial collapse or reverse. We are old-fashioned enough, however, to believe that the laws of finance, like those of other sciences, are universal and invariable in their operation; that, however they may be for a time artificially counteracted, they will ultimately assert themselves; that the mills of God, though they may grind slowly, grind exceeding small.

Mr. Boutwell finds in the treasury a surplus, above interest and expenses, greater than that of any country in the civilized world; but he finds, at the same time, our bonds selling at lower prices than those of many nations which have a chronic deficit. He finds the country, moreover, oppressed with the evils of an inconvertible currency, and an increasing disposition to neglect the labors of production for the more seductive occupation of gambling upon the stock and gold exchange. Under these circumstances he adopts the policy of getting out of

debt. This conduct in a private citizen would be highly praiseworthy; but we have grave doubts whether any person in his senses would think of buying up his own unmatured debt at a premium, while his immediate and overdue liabilities were unpaid and dishonored.

The surplus for the year ending June 30, 1869, is stated by Mr. Boutwell at forty-nine millions, and that for the succeeding year is estimated at one hundred and two millions. Setting aside the delicate question of protection, involved in the tariff, we find that in 1869 there were derived from the income-tax thirty-five millions, and from stamps sixteen millions, which sums are a direct tax upon the people at large. Now the national debt is borrowed of capitalists at six per cent, or at all events that would be the rate on a return to specie payments, and the bonds are not due for ten or fifteen years. The simple question is, whether the money is not worth more than that to the people; in other words, whether, retaining the taxes as capital, the people would not accumulate more than the amount of the interest, and thus be better able to pay the debt ten years hence than they are to-day?

If indeed there is an important improvement of credit to be gained by the purchase of bonds, or if the purchase helps us towards specie payments, these objects may be worth the sacrifice. As to the first point, a glance at English experience may not prove uninstructive. For twenty years past the English budget has shown a very small surplus, in some instances even a deficit. The government could easily have forced a surplus out of the people, but it has preferred to make constant remissions of taxation. By this course, although the English debt remains nearly or quite as large as ever, great additions have been made to the wealth of the nation, to say nothing of the immense social advantages obtained. English credit never stood higher. The burden of the debt is much less, and it could be much more easily paid off, now than in 1840. The people at large as against the capitalist have made a great and perfectly legitimate gain, in the decline in the value of money through the production of gold and silver, and the increased use of credit. It is not, moreover, an inappreciable advantage that the continued existence of the debt forms a

wholesome check upon engaging in foreign wars. If ours is not in these points a parallel case, we have yet to learn in what the difference consists.

As regards the placing of a 4½ per cent loan, we are confronted by the stubborn fact that our six-per-cents are selling below par. Mr. Boutwell states that his purchases of the six per cent five-twenty bonds have averaged in price eighty-eight and fifty-five hundredths. By what process he expects to make other people buy of him a five-per-cent bond at par is not apparent. His main argument is that the United States *ought* to borrow at a less rate, which may be a very sound one in morals; but we have doubts of its efficacy in finance. Undoubtedly our bonds have steadily continued to advance in Europe; but, on the other hand, the money-markets there have been for three years in an exceptional state of ease and stagnation, and any change must be for the worse. Credit to America has been a fruitful source of panic in the past. It is to be hoped that this time the panic will not be in proportion to the credit. As to the proposal to pay our interest in different currencies abroad, we sincerely trust that Congress will continue to interpose a firm resistance. Apart from the expense involved in bankers' commissions and the handling of exchanges, we think something is due to national dignity. We should prefer that foreigners, if they wish it, should come to us to lend, rather than that we should go to them to borrow; our finances are strong enough to be managed at home, without descending to the expedients of an insolvent railroad company. As to specie payments, we hope to show that they are a question of currency and not of funded debt.

With deference to Mr. Boutwell, then, we believe in the wisdom of such remission of taxation as will leave only a moderate surplus for a sinking-fund, to be coupled, however, with the indispensable condition of a return to specie payments at any cost.

The real cause of our impaired credit is so palpable that, if our eyes were not blinded by apparent interest, there would not be a moment's discussion about it. The United States are liable for seven hundred millions of paper money (for the government guarantees the bank circulation); that is, of promises to pay on demand, which they refuse to pay, but allow to

remain at a discount as compared with real money. The foreign holder of our bonds is in constant fear, not of total repudiation, but of payment in what we choose to call money. This fear can be at once and completely removed by making our currency convertible into gold, and in no other way. How can we ever expect our credit to be good while we refuse to do this, which, as far as the treasury is concerned, could be accomplished without difficulty? Any required portion of the notes can be withdrawn from circulation, either through the surplus revenue, or, if that fails, by funding them until their amount is so reduced that they are more in demand than specie. The objection, commonly advanced as final, to this obvious course is, that it will distress the business of the country.

We will not attempt to illustrate the evils of an irredeemable currency. Unfortunately, or fortunately, they are daily making themselves more manifest, and we listen with pleasure to the daily increasing clamor for a return to an unvarying monetary standard. President Grant says that the methods proposed for returning to specie payments are as numerous as the speculations upon political economy, but his native good sense leads him to indicate the only one which will bear the tests of logic and experience, — contraction. All the others are expedients for accomplishing the end without a fall of prices, — for enabling us to eat our cake and have it.

Mr. Boutwell thinks that the fulfilment of two conditions must precede any serious attempt to return to specie payments. As to the first, — that our bonds shall cease to be floating in the European markets, and shall be so used for permanent investments as to preclude their sudden return in large amounts, — it is necessary to say only that it is extremely uncertain whether this will ever take place, and that it would be quite impossible to know when it had taken place. In our return to specie payments and in the adjustment of our system for their maintenance, we must contemplate and be prepared to encounter a sudden reshipment of our bonds from abroad. As a second condition of a return to specie payments, Mr. Boutwell holds that the amount of our exportable products must be so increased as to affect our imports, without calling for a constant shipment of bonds and gold to settle the balance against

us. Now, the reverse condition of affairs which has prevailed for some years past we conceive to be a direct consequence of the vicious state of our currency, which will never correct itself, but can be overcome only in one of two ways, — either by a great rise in the price of gold, or by a corresponding fall of prices through contraction of the currency. In support of this position we may be pardoned for stating briefly what we believe to be the well-established basis of the theory of currency.

If the money of this country consisted wholly of gold and silver, an addition to its quantity would cause, other things being equal, a rise of prices, making it a good country to sell in and a bad country to buy in. The sales here by foreigners would then amount to more than their purchases; in other words, the imports would exceed the exports, and the balance would be taken away in money till prices fell here or rose abroad, and an equilibrium was restored. If the increase of money, instead of being in specie, consisted of paper convertible into specie, the result would be the same, except that, as foreigners would take away only specie, the proportion of specie to paper, when the equilibrium was restored, would be smaller than in the beginning. If the increase of money through paper issues were continued, a suspension of specie payments would have to be resorted to, in order to prevent all our gold being drained away. Thenceforward the protection against adverse trade would consist in the premium upon gold. If we found that our exports balanced our imports, we might conclude that the premium upon gold fairly represented the depreciation of the currency through excess; but if we found that the excess of imports still caused a drain of gold or of promises to pay gold, the conclusion would be that the premium was too low, and that an excess of currency still made this a good country to sell in and a bad one to buy in. We thus return to our original position, that the consummation desired by Mr. Boutwell is not to be arrived at by waiting, but only by a rise in the price of gold, or a direct action upon the currency.

Before entering upon the method of contraction, we will examine by the light already obtained the effect of the gold sales from which Mr. Boutwell has mainly procured the means for his large purchases of bonds. The arguments in favor of these

sales rest, first, upon the undesirability of keeping so large an amount of gold in the treasury at a loss of interest; and, secondly, upon the desirability of preventing a rise in the premium on gold through the combinations of speculators. The amount of gold in the treasury on the first day of December was one hundred and six millions, of which forty-one millions were needed for interest accrued but unpaid, and thirty-seven millions were due upon certificates of deposit payable on demand. Only twenty-eight millions therefore were left as the actual property of the treasury. Now the currency of the country, including notes of all kinds and bank deposits, is about one thousand three hundred millions. If we add, therefore, to the whole amount of gold lying in the treasury thirty millions as the amount held by the national banks (that amount consisting itself in part of treasury certificates of deposit), we have a total reserve of about ten per cent. Surely, if we are ever to resume specie payments, at least this amount of reserve must be held by somebody. As to the effect of the sales by the treasury upon the gold market, if our statement of the theory of the currency is correct, the artificial depression of the price of gold has not the smallest effect in securing a return to specie payments, but is simply an injury to the exporter of grain, cotton, etc., and a stimulus to importations by reducing the cost of imported goods. It thus tends directly to prevent the adjustment of the balance of trade so much desired by Mr. Boutwell, and is an apposite illustration of the maxim that you cannot warm a room by heating the thermometer.

But even if we have succeeded in demonstrating the necessity of contraction, in order to secure a resumption of specie payments, we have still made but little progress. The question remains, — What degree of contraction is necessary? If Mr. Boutwell had been able to depress gold to par, we should have been no nearer specie payments, because, the currency remaining as it is, the price would have been sure to rise again as soon as he stopped selling. If, then, the fall of gold to par is not the test of the possibility of resumption, what is? We answer, the condition indicated by Mr. Boutwell, that our exports shall offset our imports, in other words, the course of foreign exchange. But this is a matter not to be ascertained

at any given time, the forces at work being too silent and unseen. A currency, even though convertible, may be greatly inflated, and the adverse trade may go on for a long time, its effects being concealed through the operation of credit, until a sudden panic brings on either a suspension of specie payments or one of those ruinous crises of contraction, to which we have become so accustomed as almost to expect them in the regular course of nature.*

We are in favor of the greatest possible amount of money, provided it be gold and silver, or strictly and at all times convertible into these, because we believe that there are productive and beneficial enterprises, awaiting development, sufficient to employ it all. We do not yield on this point to the wildest inflationist, provided the condition of convertibility can be secured beyond contingency. Contraction under a crude and ill-digested system, requiring it to be carried farther than is necessary, would be useless torture, and a check upon the productive enterprise of the country. Can our existing system be justly thus characterized or not?

We have, at the present time, a double currency, consisting of legal-tender notes, known as greenbacks, and of notes of national banks. The greenbacks cost the government nothing beyond the expense of preparation. They formed the entire currency of the country during the greater part of the war, and answered perfectly the end of furnishing a uniform national currency. The national-bank system was originated by Mr. Chase and his supporters, to enable him to evade the positive refusal of Congress to increase the amount of greenbacks beyond four hundred and fifty millions, and by this means to make it possible to float a five-per-cent loan at par. When one considers the part taken by Chief Justice Chase in placing us in our present position, it seems like a jest to talk of the Supreme Court declaring the legal-tender act unconstitutional, and thus exposing the country to the distress of this crudest and clumsiest form of contraction. It could easily be shown,

* The desideratum is, then, such an adjustment of our system of currency as will show, as nearly as possible at any time, the actual state of our foreign trade; shall detect inflation and adverse trade at the earliest moment; shall, of its own action, interpose resistance, and effect the contraction necessary to restore the due level.

did space allow, that the national-bank circulation costs the government fully fifteen millions per annum, exclusive of all taxes and deductions *incident to circulation.* At this cost it certainly ought to possess some important advantages over greenbacks, but in point of uniformity it is certainly not better, being issued by different banks, and in security it stands on precisely the same footing as the greenbacks; the treasury guarantees its prompt redemption on the failure of any bank, it having been clearly seen from the first that on no other condition would the national-bank notes circulate at par. The government has a nominal security in the deposit of bonds, the lien on deposits, and the liability of stockholders. But is it worth fifteen millions of dollars per annum to the government to be guaranteed against the repudiation of its own promises? *

The suggestion of redemption is a simple absurdity. To sort out and return the notes to the issuing banks would be a burden which nobody has the slightest inducement to assume. Of three hundred and seventeen millions of notes which have been issued, only seventeen millions have been exchanged for new notes, the remainder having been in circulation for nearly five years. The condition of these notes fully justifies the sarcasm that, "if we must have an inconvertible paper, we might, at least, have a decent one." The bank officers will tell you, with a wondering chuckle, that they do not know what has become of their circulation, as they have never seen it since it was issued, their functions being limited to the pleasant task of receiving their semi-annual dividends.

It is claimed that the banks aided largely in placing the government loans. We believe that the issue of a corresponding amount of greenbacks would have been just as effectual; but, granting this claim, it may be urged that the sixty or seventy millions which the banks have received have been a full compensation for this service, and that it is time to turn over a new leaf. The great argument against greenbacks, and a perfectly sound one, is that they are liable to be issued in ex-

* Be it observed that this fifteen millions is precisely the sum which Mr. Boutwell proposes to save by refunding one thousand millions of bonds at four and one-half per cent. We venture to recommend to him to turn his attention to a more practicable retrenchment.

cess on every sudden impulse of the government. But unfortunately, the argument is applicable in its full extent to the bank circulation. The three hundred millions authorized by Congress were absorbed just as easily as the four hundred millions of greenbacks, and three hundred millions more might have been issued and absorbed in like manner. In the case of bank-notes, moreover, there is a compact and powerful body of men always interested in urging increased issues. We hear already that the South and West require more banking facilities, which means that there are numerous associations of individuals in those sections desirous of sharing in the public plunder.

Presuming that there must be some defence of this system possible, we turn to the Report of the Comptroller of the Currency: "There are two kinds of currency in use, — one issued directly by the government; the other issued by the banks. One kind would seem to be enough. The best should be preserved and perfected, the other withdrawn."

"Applying the test first to the government issues, it is noted at once that they are not redeemable, and that no provision has ever been made for that purpose. The very moment they are made redeemable, they will cease to answer the purposes of currency; for after they are redeemed, they are in the treasury and cannot be paid out, except as disbursement may be necessary to pay expenses and debts of the government." There is a convenient confusion of thought here between the terms "redeemable" and "redeemed"; but the objection, if fatal to greenbacks, has fully as much force against bank-notes.

"So that government circulation is not convertible and therefore is not elastic, and cannot be made so without a radical change in the organization of the United States treasury, by which it should be converted into a huge banking institution calculated to receive deposits, make loans, and otherwise perform the functions of a national bank." Upon this point we propose to join issue presently.

"The notes issued by national banks are nominally redeemable" (in illustration of our charge of confusion of thought, above, we may add that not even nominally are they *redeemed*); "and if the legal-tenders were out of the way, would be actually so," — an assertion which seems to us a very fair example

of *petitio principii*. The Comptroller goes on to say that the greenbacks must be absorbed in large amounts for government dues, and largely disbursed at other times, and in both cases without reference to the wants of trade. We think a little reflection would have convinced him that the same thing must occur, whatever currency is used, and that it is not a question of the kind of notes, but of the financial arrangements of the treasury.

"The argument that the government should furnish the currency, in order that it may realize the profit upon its circulation, is a common one, but will not bear scrutiny. There is no profit to the government on the circulation of an inferior currency. Only a sound currency will promote the material prosperity of the people; and the government can realize no profit from anything detrimental to their interests." All this proceeds upon the assumption that the government currency must necessarily be inferior. If it can be shown that the government currency can be made equally sound with the bank-notes, or more sound, there is nothing said here which should lead us to forego the saving of fifteen millions of dollars per annum.

"No human intelligence can fix the amount of currency that is really needed; for it is continually varying and never fixed." To this proposition we yield a ready assent, but we think that it by no means justifies the inference that "no check or limitation should be imposed upon it other than the law of supply and demand." If this principle be sound, it might be proved that we have not now too much currency, as the demand is fully equal to the supply; and if the latter were increased by three hundred millions more, there would be a demand for it all. It may be safely asserted that what is called "free banking" is incompatible with the maintenance of a permanent specie basis.

"A self-adjusting system of currency is the only one that is adapted to the exigencies of trade and to the wants of the country; and it is a vital question, at this time, whether this result can be reached before the return to specie payments. If possible at all, it is only possible through the agency of the national banks." We wish that, instead of a sweeping assertion, the Comptroller had given some explanation of the process by which the result is to be reached; how the specie in

the treasury is to be distributed through the vaults of seventeen hundred banks. Of course resumption must be simultaneous throughout the country. New York and Boston cannot move till Chicago, St. Louis, and New Orleans are ready. But, supposing this condition fulfilled, will all the bank-notes circulate at par? We have pointed out that even on a greenback basis the government was forced to guarantee the redemption of the bank-notes, in order to make them circulate at par. Will they be more current when the banks have to pay specie? Or are we to have the spectacle of specie-paying banks whose issues shall be guaranteed by the government?

We have denied that the law of supply and demand furnishes a test of the proper quantity of currency, and have proposed instead the relation of the amount of our currency to that of other countries as indicated by the foreign exchanges, or, as Mr. Boutwell puts it, by the equilibrium of our exports and imports. To ascertain this relation, a delicate self-adjusting index is necessary, and we maintain that the system of bank currency is the very worst possible for this purpose. This is a specie-producing country, and the export of specie is just as legitimate as that of grain, provided it does not touch the reserves which insure the redemption of the currency. If those reserves are scattered through numerous banks, there are no means of distinguishing a foreign drain, which implies excessive issues, from a run for gold which might occur from distrust of the banks, and be quite compatible with a currency unduly contracted. And further, as the specie reserves are liable to the claims of depositors, a withdrawal of gold would not of necessity enforce a contraction of issues of notes.

We have stated our belief that the argument against a direct issue of treasury-notes like greenbacks, based on its liability to political tampering, is a perfectly sound one. We think, however, that a modification of the system of treasury issues could be arranged which would suit all the requirements of the situation.

The ideal system of the bullionist is one by which every note issued should have an actual deposit of bullion against it, which should be held intact for its redemption. Of course there would then be no possibility of suspension. This system,

however, would require an immense amount of gold to be kept idle, with a loss of interest which would never be submitted to. But the same result may be obtained with a much smaller amount of reserves. A certain amount of currency must always remain afloat in the country, and can never be presented for redemption, because, before contraction could go so far, the fall of prices would be so great as to draw specie from abroad. This amount, which would be wholly matter of experiment, might be issued upon fixed securities like government bonds. After that, every note issued should have a deposit of specie against it.

Further explanation may be best given in a practical form. Upon this plan the government would charter a corporation in New York, entitled, we will say, the Office of Issue. It would be owned and guaranteed by the banks, and its officers would be appointed by the banks and the government jointly. It would have, however, nothing whatever to do with banking, its business being purely mechanical, and confined to the issue of currency. The government would then present the national bank-notes as fast as received from taxes, etc., to the issuing banks, to be redeemed in greenbacks, with the alternative of allowing the notes to be cancelled, together with the corresponding amount of bonds deposited against them. To get the money for its disbursements, the government would then transfer to the Office of Issue the same amount of bonds, and receive the notes of the office. If we suppose all the bank-notes to be thus called in and the new notes substituted, the Office of Issue would then hold the same amount of bonds as the banks now hold, but in lieu of interest it would receive a fixed sum to be agreed upon in concert with the treasury, as a compensation for furnishing the circulation. Probably three millions of dollars, or the one per cent tax which the banks now pay the government, would be gladly accepted; but if it were made five millions, there would be a clear saving of upwards of twelve millions to the treasury over the present system. After the point of three hundred millions was reached, the Office would issue its notes only in exchange for greenbacks. Its notes would be a legal tender through the whole country, except at the place of issue, and it would be always bound to re-

deem any of its notes in greenbacks. Thus, even with the present amount of currency, we should have a central point to which the stream of notes would constantly flow, and the office would be required to keep them constantly fresh and clean.*

Now commences the work of contraction. The government would proceed to call in and cancel the greenbacks; and with the fall of prices, which, be it observed, is the real end towards which contraction is only a means, it would happen that at some point bullion instead of greenbacks would be brought to the office for notes, which is in fact a resumption of specie payments. When the amount of specie in the office should reach, we will say twenty-five millions, the treasury would turn over to it all the stock of gold held by the latter, and would receive notes in exchange. Thenceforward all the government business, including customs and the payment of interest, would be transacted by means of office notes.

It remains to show how specie payments could be maintained. In the first place, the specie in the Office of Issue could not be exhausted, because, as we have seen, the contraction of its notes would make the money-market so tight as to draw gold from abroad. Again, though there would be no other issue of notes in the country, deposit banking might be entirely free, subject to the condition that every bank should hold a proportion of reserve in notes of the Office; distrust of the banks would not, therefore, cause a demand for gold, but only for these notes. The demand for gold would be only for the wants of foreign trade. If this demand was only for our surplus product of the article, it would go on without causing any disturbance; but if through bank inflation our imports became excessive, gold would be demanded for notes at the Office of Issue. The loss of gold by the Office would give public notice of approaching contraction, and its continuance, with the withdrawal of notes, would enforce contraction of loans by the banks and of deposits, until gold ceased to flow abroad and began to accumulate in the Office of Issue, when the fresh supply of notes against it would put an

* The Comptroller advocates the establishment of a central agency for the redemption of the notes of the banks. What we propose is, that the agency shall issue as well as redeem the notes, and thus save an endless controversy about the rights and duties of the numerous banks.

end to contraction. The advantage thus gained would be the detection of inflation at the earliest possible point, and its correction by moderate contraction, instead of allowing it to go on unperceived till it ended in the violent contraction of a monetary panic.

If this were an *a priori* scheme, "evolved out of our own consciousness," we should hesitate to claim for it any superiority over the thousands of others which have appeared in the newspapers. But it happens that substantially the same thing has been subjected to the test of twenty-five years' experience in Great Britain, what we have called the Office of Issue being there known as the "Issue Department of the Bank of England." At no time during this period has the slightest doubt been thrown on the credit of the Bank of England, nor has the Issue Department failed to have on hand an abundant stock of specie. The money-crises of 1847, 1857, and 1866, and the consequent suspensions of the act of 1844, which were in no sense, however, a suspension of specie payments, were due to defects, which we cannot now point out, in the English system of banking as distinguished from the issue of currency; but the soundness of the principle on which the act of 1844 was based has been, as we believe, established beyond a doubt.

Lack of space has allowed us to give only a rapid sketch of the system thus advocated, and the same cause prevents us from anticipating and answering the numerous objections which may be urged against it. If we should be fortunate enough to draw them out from others, we hope to be fully prepared with a reply. One incidental advantage of this system, however, we cannot omit to notice. Both Mr. Boutwell and the Comptroller of the Currency inveigh against the practice of allowing interest on deposits, which are used by the New York banks in fostering speculation by means of loans on call. But these deposits are a part of the reserve which the law requires to be kept by the country banks. They must be loaned on call if at all, and the prohibition of interest upon them, even if it were not evaded, as it easily might be, would only give so much more profit to the New York banks. Under the proposed system, no bank would hold any reserve against circulation; and as the country banks would have to meet a demand for depos-

its only at their own counter, they would need no reserve beyond the actual notes in their vaults.

In closing this review, we must confess that we anticipate but little good from any amount of popular essays upon the subject. The real field of contest is in Congress; and as that body is at present organized there is but little chance of any question being treated upon its own merits, apart from the pressure of private interests. Every individual who can speak on the floor of the House is answerable to a knot of constituents, and is pursued by their private claims. Members who have the courage and independence to care for the interest of the country have no rallying-point for combination. Already we hear that there is a jealousy of the Committee on Banking and Currency, because General Garfield, the chairman, is known to favor contraction; and there is a disposition to refer everything to the Committee of Ways and Means. The head of the Executive Department, who may be supposed to represent the whole country, and to have no interest but in the success of his administration, has no means of enforcing his views but by "lobbying" with the committees, or by messages to Congress, which the majority can easily dispose of by referring them to a committee.* There is no people in the world so quick as ours to enter into or form a judgment upon public questions, but they are now debarred from getting the requisite information, because the debates are one-sided. If a Secretary of the Treasury, determined upon contraction, and ready to defend his position, were to take his stand in the House, and rally around him the independent minority of whom we have spoken, the country would be able to get at the merits of the case, and the elections would give the final decision of the people. We have a strong conviction that the essential preliminary to any reform, whether in finance, or the civil and diplomatic services, will consist in the admission of the heads of departments to the floor of Congress.

GAMALIEL BRADFORD.

* We understand that the national banks in convention have appointed a committee, of which Senator (or Representative?) Pomeroy is president, to look after their interests in the matter of adverse legislation. We should like to see somebody in Congress representing the interest of the whole people against legislation to be secured by bank combination.

Art. VII. — CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. — *Across America and Asia. Notes of a Five Years' Journey around the World, and of Residence in Arizona, China, and Japan.* By Raphael Pumpelly. New York: Leypoldt and Holt. 1870. 8vo. pp. 454.

Mr. Pumpelly is a new writer in a new field. His book is consequently fresh throughout, — fresh in material and fresh in style. He has seen the border lands of our own country under very exciting circumstances, and has visited the interior of two of the oldest empires of the globe, with opportunities for investigation rarely if ever enjoyed by a modern scientific observer. The narrative which describes his protracted journey is at once sensible and racy, full of important facts, and enlivened by entertaining adventures. It is rarely the fortune of a young man to have so good a tale to tell, it is rarer still for a young man to tell his tale so well. The writer seems indeed to carry his professional experience as a miner into literary labors, knowing where to find the metal worth having, and how to separate it from slag and dross. Throughout the volume it is apparent that the author is a man of science. He is keen in his observations, guarded in his statements, alive to all the phenomena of nature, interested especially in the minerals, the rocks, and the physical structure of the lands he visits. On the other hand, his book is not a scientific book, but a popular narrative of travel in paths rarely trodden by Americans, and even less frequently described by skilful pens. Some portions of the volume relate to scenes and places hitherto quite unknown to the Western world; and those pages which deal with the geology of China and Japan are an important contribution to scientific literature, though the more strictly scientific results of his Oriental researches have been previously published by the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. Pumpelly was not a professional explorer of new countries, nor was he even a traveller by forethought and choice. He was an educated, wide-awake American, whose versatility, energy, and well-trained eye were recognized everywhere, and were constant introductions to new acquaintances and to new occupations. Hence he was led on from mountain to coast, from land to sea, from island to main, and so through nearly all the phases of modern life in the north temperate zone.

In the autumn of 1860, Mr. Pumpelly, having, if we are rightly informed, completed his professional studies in some of the mining-

schools in Europe, was sent out as a mining-engineer to Santa Rita, in Arizona, where he was engaged to take charge of the silver-mines for a year. Thus began a career of exciting adventure and study, which took him around the globe, and brought him back to this country at the end of five years. In this journey nearly seventeen thousand miles of his wanderings were by land, six thousand of these being accomplished on horseback. Three distinct divisions may consequently be recognized in this traveller's tale, — Arizona, Japan, and China, — with a postscript on Siberia and Central Russia; and to each of these sections we shall briefly refer.

The Arizona chapters are horrible revelations of the barbarism of the Apaches, and the no less hateful barbarism of the outcasts from civilization who infested the mountains, and impeded the work of honest men, from 1857 till 1862, and even to a later period. "Murder was the order of the day among a total white and peon population of a few thousand souls. It was daily committed by Americans upon Americans, Mexicans, and Indians; by Mexicans upon Americans; and the hand of the Apache was, with reason, against both of the intruding races." The charge of a silver-mine, in the midst of such a murderous and plundering community, with the nearest court several hundred miles distant, was not a sinecure. When we read of the tragical fate of Grosvenor, Mr. Pumpelly's companion, and the agent of the Santa Rita mines, we understand how a valley which in natural beauty "seemed a paradise" was changed by man into "a very prison of hell."

After our blood has tingled with the story of Indian atrocity, as witnessed by this young mining-engineer, we are struck dumb by his admission that such barbarity on the part of the red men is due chiefly to the injustice and duplicity of the whites. No language seems to Mr. Pumpelly too severe when he speaks of the mode in which our countrymen have been dealing with the Indians. We sincerely hope that "the Quaker policy" (if that means honesty and justice) of our fighting President is introducing a change which will in time soften, if it does not civilize, the remnant of the aborigines. We commend the narrative of these mining experiences in Arizona, and the reflections they suggest, to all who are interested in the westward march of civilization. Not less stirring is the story of the journey overland from Santa Rita to San Francisco; but we can merely allude to these exciting incidents, which are, after all, only a prelude to the principal portion of the volume.

With the tact to which we have before referred, the writer touches lightly upon his experience in California and upon his glimpses of the

Sandwich Islands, and rapidly transports the reader across the Pacific. The Japanese government having sent to this country for two geologists and mining-engineers to explore a part of the Japanese Empire, it was Mr. Pumpelly's good fortune to be selected for this service, and he set sail for Yokahama, in November, 1861, with his associate, Mr. W. P. Blake. A voyage of ninety days brought him to the island empire, which he entered through the bay of Yeddo. He remained in Yokohama, making occasional excursions to various interesting localities in its immediate vicinity, for about three months, much of which time was spent in the study of the spoken language, preparatory to the official services which the government had proposed. Among the most interesting objects to be seen in the neighborhood of Yokohama is the Daibutz, a wonderful statue of Buddha at Kamakura. It represents Buddha as having attained, after ages of purification, *nirvana*, the state of utter annihilation of external consciousness. This colossal figure, which is in bronze, fifty feet high, and ninety-six feet in circumference at the base, is described by Mr. Pumpelly as a work of high art. "I felt," he says, "that I saw for the first time, and where I least expected it, a realization in art of a religious idea. No Madonna on canvas or Christ in marble had been other to me than suggestive through the aid of an acquaintance with the subjects treated. This Buddha of Kamakura is a successful rendering of a profound religious abstraction." A photo-lithograph of this remarkable figure is given as a frontispiece to the volume.

The difficulties which beset the engineers are rather hinted at than fully described. Mr. Pumpelly appears to have fallen in with well-informed foreigners, and gives in several excellent essays the result of his inquiries into Japanese politics and religions, and likewise his impressions in respect to the principles of national intercourse between Oriental and Occidental peoples. He severely denounces the practice of abusing the inhabitants or the authorities of Chinese and Japanese cities as if they "had no rights which white men are bound to respect."

At length the two geologists, having spent but a day in the capital, are sent to Yesso, the most northern island of the group, to begin their professional work. Even here their journey was restricted to a comparatively small region, in the southern peninsula of the island, around Hakodadi, the open port of the north. A route-map inserted in the volume renders it easy to follow the travellers in this part of their work, and makes us regret that a similar sketch was not given of the vicinity of Yokohama. For want of the latter, an ordinary reader is not a little embarrassed.

We shall not attempt to introduce our readers to the mineralogical

and metallurgical notes which are suggested by the two journeys in Southern Yesso, — to the solfatara of Esan and of Iwaounobori (where the government works produce monthly about sixty-four thousand pounds, at a total cost of $183.25), to the lead-mines of Ichinowatari and Yurup, to the gold-washings of Kunnui, and to the bituminous coal-beds near the Kaiyanobetz Creek. How much there is for the Japanese to learn, respecting the development of these mineral resources, may be inferred from the fact that these American miners made the first application of powder to mining that had ever been attempted in Japan. Though China and Japan have so long used gunpowder, this application of it has been neglected from ignorance or from fear. Suggestions were made to the Japanese in respect to the introduction of pumping-machinery in their mines, and other useful instructions were given to the native officers attached to the Americans; but all at once, the Taicoon, alarmed, or compelled by the anti-foreign party to give up some of his liberal schemes, closed his engagement with the Messrs. Pumpelly and Blake, in February, 1863. The year which they had spent in Japan had been a good preparation for future work, and the tears which were shed when the parting came, by the young officers who had been companions and pupils of the foreigners, showed how much they had valued the instruction received. "They were the only tears I saw in the eyes of a man in Japan or China," says Mr. Pumpelly.

We ought not to turn from this portion of the book without mentioning that a chapter on Japanese Art is introduced, from the pen of Mr. John Lafarge, illustrated by fac-simile prints.

There is, to us, less that is novel in Mr. Pumpelly's narrative of his experience in China than in the other portions of the book; but even these chapters are marked by the same vivid descriptions, the same good sense, and the same freedom from threadbare reflections, which characterize the remainder of his work.

His interior travels began with a boat-journey up the Yangtse River, extending over a period of two months. He visited Hankau, that wonderfully populous aggregation of towns, and then pushed on to Changsha, the capital of Hunan, hoping to penetrate to the coal-fields in the southern part of that province, and then to ascend the river to a still higher point. But the farther he went, the more obstacles he encountered, in consequence of the hostility felt towards foreigners; and so, from Changsha, he reversed his course, and returned to Shanghai.

Pekin was his next centre of observation. Here he became freed from the prejudices he had contracted on the coast, and, under the influences of Mr. Burlingame and Sir Frederick Bruce, began to look upon the peo-

ple of China from a new point of view. At the instance of these two diplomatists, the Chinese government requested Mr. Pumpelly to examine some of their chief coal-fields, with reference to supplying with fuel the new flotilla of gunboats which had then just been purchased in England. The geological conference, over a lunch with the Board of Foreign Affairs, brought out some curious Chinese hypotheses. Among them was a theory of the growth of coal in abandoned mines: everything being produced by the coaction of *yin* and *yang*, force and matter, the active and the passive, the male and the female, principles in nature, why should not coal be continually produced in circumstances which once favored it?

Under this appointment, Mr. Pumpelly examined the coal-measures to the northwest of Pekin, his account of which has been published in the papers of the Smithsonian Institution; but, on returning to Pekin from this first official reconnoissance, he learned that the Imperial authorities had decided to send back to England the flotilla, and were consequently quite indifferent to the further prosecution of his geological inquiries.

An excursion of six weeks along the great wall, a visit to Nagasaki, and the long homeward journey across Tartary, Siberia, and Russia, furnish abundant materials for further descriptions, — too abundant for any detailed notice here.

Two noteworthy chapters are thrown into the midst of these vivacious narratives, — one on the Chinese as emigrants, and the other on Western policy in China. Both of these are important in their bearing upon the great Chinese problem, which throughout the world now attracts such marked attention from philanthropists and statesmen. With the liberal views of the author the readers of this Review are already acquainted.

We have noticed many typographical slips in our copy of this volume, and some slight literary inaccuracies, but they do not impair the great merits of this work, and, as the publishers have announced a revised edition, require no further notice here.

---

2. — *Geological Survey of California.* J. D. Whitney, State Geologist.

1. *The Yosemite Book: A Description of the Yosemite Valley and the adjacent Region of the Sierra Nevada, and of the Big Trees of California, illustrated by Maps and Photographs.* Published by authority of the Legislature. New York: Julius Bien. 1868. 4to. pp. 116.

2. *The Yosemite Guide-Book: a Description of the Yosemite Valley and the adjacent Region of the Sierra Nevada, and of the Big Trees of California, illustrated by Maps and Woodcuts.* Published by authority of the Legislature. 1869. University Press: Cambridge. 8vo. pp. 155.

In 1864 the United States Congress passed an act granting the Yosemite Valley and the Mariposa grove of "Big Trees" to the State of California, "upon the express conditions that the premises shall be held for public use, resort, and recreation, and shall be inalienable for all time," etc. The State accepted the gift with the imposed conditions, and appointed commissioners to take charge of the property. Professor Whitney was one of them. In his official capacity as State Geologist, he had previously devoted considerable attention to that region, but under the new condition of things he extended his explorations and surveys, and in these volumes the results are given to the public. They are in fact two editions of the same work, — the first a sumptuously prepared "gift-book," of which but two hundred and fifty copies were published; a work of art, illustrated by twenty-eight full-page photographs, taken by Watkins, who was before widely known for his artistic photographs of that region. The second contains, in a form more suitable for a "guide-book," essentially the same text, with some verbal corrections and the addition of about twenty pages to the chapter relating to "the High Sierra," and is illustrated with woodcuts selected from those already used by the same author in the first volume of the "Geology of California."

It is fortunate that we have these descriptions from a master, whose powers find here a worthy theme, and whose reputation as a man of science is a guaranty of accuracy of statement. The prominent features of the scenery of the region here described are unique. High mountains, lofty waterfalls, deep valleys, towering precipices, and grand forests belong to every continent, yet there is but one Yosemite, and one restricted *habitat* of the "Big Trees," the giant Sequoias.

The Merced River rises in the Sierra Nevada, about one hundred and seventy-five miles in a direct line from San Francisco, and in nearly the same latitude, in a conspicuous group of peaks, the highest of which rise to above thirteen thousand feet. It flows westward to the San Joaquin, its waters ultimately reaching the Pacific by the latter river. The valley of the Merced proper is about seventy miles long, and in that short distance sinks from the altitude of the above-mentioned high peaks nearly to the level of the sea, eight thousand feet of

this fall occurring on the upper fifteen miles. This river, whose entire length is not one fourth that of the Hudson, or less than the distance from New York to Poughkeepsie, collects its waters amid the perpetual snows of an arctic climate, and pours them into a valley of almost tropical heat. The extreme upper branches, gathering their waters from the snow-banks of numerous peaks, and from the alpine lakes that lie among them, flow in rather open valleys, lying entirely above the altitude of seven thousand feet, whose sides are all polished by former glaciers, through alpine meadows or "flats"; then suddenly pour in numerous waterfalls over the rocky walls of a grand chasm, from three thousand to five thousand feet deep, and unite in this with the main river, which finds its way westward through a deep V-shaped ravine or cañon. This passes down through the forests, through the mining-belt, then winds a short distance between the gentle foot-hills, to find its way to the great San Joaquin plain. A small portion of this valley — the chasm before spoken of, some six or eight miles long — is known as the Yosemite Valley. In its geological features this is not peculiar, for the valleys of other streams in the same belt of the Sierra, both on the north and south, from the Hetch-Hetchy on the Tuolumne to the Upper Kern, have a similar character; but in no other are there so many striking features, nor such a combination of grand scenic effects. It is in an æsthetic rather than in a strictly geological sense that the valley is unique.

"The principal features of the Yosemite, and those by which it is distinguished from all other known valleys, are, first, the near approach to verticality of its walls; second, their great height, not only absolutely, but as compared with the width of the valley itself; and, finally, the very small amount of *talus* or *débris* at the base of these gigantic cliffs." These are the great characteristics of the valley throughout its whole length; but besides these there are other striking peculiarities, of even greater interest to the tourist, — features of sublimity and beauty, which can hardly be surpassed, if indeed equalled, by those of any other mountain valley in the world. Among these are particularly the domes, the waterfalls, the purity and transparency of the air, and the brilliancy and variety of atmospheric effects.

The description of this valley and its surroundings occupies, of course, the greater part of the volume, and in no other guide-book have we seen so charming a combination of scientific accuracy with poetic sensibility. The Yosemite waterfall is the highest yet discovered on the globe, being about two thousand six hundred feet (nearly half a mile) high. Several others in the valley rank in the first class; and to a description of these is appended, for comparison, a short account of the

highest waterfalls of other countries. The precipice of the "Half-Dome," nearly a mile high, — in half of that height being absolutely vertical, and in the rest nearly so, — is perhaps the most remarkable precipice in the world. The various "Domes," some of them almost as symmetrical in form as the domes of art, are features scarcely less striking, and their heights are given in thousands of feet almost as familiarly as we talk of other great heights in hundreds.

Over the whole of the elevated region which drains into the Yosemite, the snows of winter fall to a depth of twenty, thirty, and, in some years, even of fifty feet. This snowy winter is followed by a long rainless summer, when for months the sky is almost cloudless. Then the snows melt with great rapidity, and disappear, except at altitudes above eleven thousand feet. The Yosemite has an altitude of about four thousand feet above the sea. A lake probably occupied the bottom of this chasm in earlier geological ages; but now it is a comparatively level park, six or seven miles long, and from three fourths of a mile to two miles wide, with forests and meadows beautifully intermingled, through which the river meanders as if resting after the tumult it has passed through, and recovering strength for the passage of the dreary cañon below. Near the upper end there is one lovely little lake, on whose glassy surface are mirrored the gigantic walls of granite which bound the valley.

In the spring, while the snow still lies in great, unbroken fields above, the green valley and the profuse and brilliant flowers make a contrast even more striking than that of the *Jardin* in the *Mer de Glace*. As the snows rapidly melt under the fervid sun, the streams become torrents, rushing down the upper valleys, and tumbling over the great walls in thundering cataracts, showering their spray far and wide over the fairy scene below. At the same time numerous smaller rivulets pour over the edge of the precipices, — here in mere threads of spray three thousand feet high, there in cascades of greater size, — but all dwindle or dry up as the summer advances. Even *Pohono*, or the "Bridal-Veil Fall," over eight hundred feet high, which is a great cataract in the spring, by midsummer is but a mere sheet of spray, falling, white and airy as a lace veil, from the brow to the foot of the dark granite precipice, and waving hither and thither with the changing breeze. Still later it is reduced to a mere thread, or disappears entirely. As the summer passes into autumn, only the large streams remain, and these are but feeble representatives of what they were a few months before. Then the valley is bathed in that delicate haze which no painter has yet successfully represented upon canvas; the meadows

are sere, the air parched, and strange colors play over the mountain-summits above.

From this valley the author carries us to the High Sierra, beginning with the region back of the Yosemite, — a region which rivals the Alps in interest, being greater in mass, and scarcely inferior in height. There is less of variety and beauty in these mountains than in the Alps, but they possess perhaps even more grandeur and sublimity. This group of peaks, of which Mount Dana is the highest, will probably remain the most popular region of the High Sierra for tourists to visit, because more accessible, and more varied in scenery, than any other of equal altitude. South of this is a higher group of peaks, lying near the head of Kern River, of peculiar interest, because its highest point, Mount Whiting, is the highest peak known in the United States, — fifteen thousand feet; and this is surrounded by over half a score of other mountains rising to above fourteen thousand feet.

The last chapter of the Guide-Book is devoted to the "Big Trees," and we have here the fullest account yet published of the objects themselves, of their history, and of the remarkable Indian, Sequoyah, in whose honor the genus was named.

This Guide-Book is not a mere compilation of facts already given to the public. The world has heard of the Yosemite, of the High Sierra Nevada, and of the giant Sequoias; but this book is the result of original explorations, surveys, and researches, made under the author's direction, and continued at intervals from 1863 to 1868.

The two maps which accompany the volume are of peculiar interest and excellence; one is a map of the Yosemite itself and its immediate surroundings; the other, of the whole of that portion of the High Sierra which extends from the mining-belt on the west to the eastern base at Mono Lake, — an area of upwards of twenty-seven hundred square miles. This map is drawn on a scale of two miles to the inch. The district thus portrayed is one of the roughest mountain regions in the United States, if not in North America, and this map is the first topographical representation, with minute accuracy of detail, of any similar mountain region on the continent. The field-work which served as its basis involved an amount of laborious exploration, fatigue, difficulty, and danger, which would make a thrilling narrative; though all this is merely hinted at in the work before us. The book and its maps rise therefore out of the class of mere guide-books, and take a high place among the contributions to American science. We earnestly hope that the Golden State will enable the same author to give us similar descriptions of other parts of that land of marvels.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCXXVII.

APRIL, 1870.

Art. I. — The Physics and Physiology of Spiritualism.

There is an inherent tendency in the mind of man to ascribe to supernatural agencies those events the causes of which are beyond his knowledge; and this is especially the case with the normal and morbid phenomena which are manifested in his own person. But as his intellect becomes more thoroughly trained, and as science advances in its developments, the range of his credulity becomes more and more circumscribed, his doubts are multiplied, and he at length reaches that condition of "healthy scepticism" which allows of no belief without the proof. Thus he does not now credit the existence of an *archæus* dwelling in the stomach and presiding over its function, for he knows by experiment that digestion is a purely physical process, which can be as well performed in a teacup with a little pepsin and dilute chlorhydric acid as in the stomach with the gastric-juice; he does not now believe that the bodies of lunatics, epileptics, and hysterical women are inhabited by devils and demons, for he has ascertained by observation that the abnormal conditions present in such persons can be accounted for by material derangements of the organs or functions of the system. He has learned to doubt, and therefore to reason better; he makes experiments, collects facts, does not begin to theorize till his data are sufficient, and then is careful that his theories do not

extend beyond the foundation of certainty, or at least of probability, upon which he builds.

But there have always been, and probably always will be, individuals whose love for the marvellous is so great, and whose logical powers are so small, as to render them susceptible of entertaining any belief, no matter how preposterous it may be; and others more numerous who, staggered by facts which they cannot understand, accept any hypothesis which may be offered as an explanation, rather than confess their ignorance.

The real and fraudulent phenomena of what is called spiritualism are of such a character as to make a profound impression upon the credulous and the ignorant; and both these classes have accordingly been active in spreading the most exaggerated ideas relative to matters which are either absurdly false or not so very astonishing when viewed by the cold light of science. Such persons have, probably, from a very early age, believed in the materiality of spirits; and having very little knowledge of the forces inherent in their own bodies, have no difficulty in ascribing occurrences which do not accord with their experience to the agency of disembodied individuals whom they imagine to be circulating through the world. In this respect they resemble those savages who regard the burning-lens, the mirror, and other things which produce unfamiliar effects, as being animated by deities. Their minds are decidedly fetish-worshipping in character, and are scarcely, in this respect, of a more elevated type than that of the Congo negro who endows the rocks and trees with higher mental attributes than he claims for himself.

Then it is possible for the most careful and experienced judgment to be deceived by false sensorial impressions of real objects, or by non-existing images created by the mind. In the first case a gleam of moonlight passes for a ghost, the stump of a tree becomes a robber, and the rustling of leaves blown by the wind is imagined to be the whispering of voices. No one possesses an absolute perfection of sensation, and thus things are never seen, or heard, or smelt, or tasted, or felt exactly as they exist. In the dark, or in the uncertain light of the moon, or of artificial illumination, the liability to self-

deception is very much increased; and if, in addition to the defect of light, there are continual sounds and other means of engaging the attention, it is exceedingly easy to induce sensorial confusion, and thus to impose upon the intellect.

As regards purely imaginary images, — that is, images not based on any sensorial impression, — the difficulty is in the brain. An excess or deficiency of blood circulating through this organ, or a morbid alteration of its quality, such as is induced by alcohol, opium, belladonna, and other similar substances, will often lead to hallucinations. Various mental emotions act in a like manner by their influence in deranging the central circulation. A gentleman, under the professional charge of the writer, can always cause the appearance of images by tying a handkerchief moderately tightly around his neck; and there is one form which is always the first to come and the last to disappear. It consists of a male figure clothed in the costume worn in England three hundred years ago, and bearing a striking resemblance to the portraits of Sir Walter Raleigh. This figure not only imposes on the sight, but also on the hearing; for questions put to it are answered promptly and with much more intellectual force than are those addressed to the so-called "spirits." How easy would it be for the gentleman subject to this hallucination, were he a believer in spiritualism and less intelligent, to imagine that his visitor was a spirit, and that he held converse with the real Sir Walter Raleigh!

The fact that multitudes may be simultaneously impressed with the same belief is no guaranty that this belief is founded on reality. A great many otherwise sensible people have been convinced that the blood of Saint Januarius periodically undergoes liquefaction; yet those whose education and habits of thought teach them to look upon such so-called miracles with distrust are not brought to accept the truth of the legend because many thousands of other persons have received it in full faith.

There are two forces resulting from vitality which may or may not be correlative, but which are of such a nature that some of their more unusual manifestations excite the astonishment of the vulgar, and are inexplicable to many who con-

sider themselves learned. These are the mind and animal electricity. The latter, thanks to the investigations of Nobili, Matteucci, Müller, Du Bois, Reymond, and others, is beginning to be understood, and its phenomena reduced to fixed laws. All our knowledge of animal electricity tends to show that it does not differ in any essential particular from the galvanism developed outside of the body by chemical action; and that the tissues of the organism, the bones, muscles, nerves, etc., act towards it precisely as they do towards the galvanism which passes along an iron or copper wire and sets a telegraphic instrument in operation. It is impossible for us, therefore, to attribute any of the real or false manifestations of modern spiritualism to this force; and those persons who do so show themselves to be not fully acquainted either with what is asserted of spiritualism, or with electricity in its internal or external relations with the animal body. The idea that tables are moved, knocks made, and apparitions produced by the electricity of the body is simply absurd.

The mind — under which term are included the intellect, the emotions, and the will — is ordinarily supposed to have its seat wholly in the brain. That its higher manifestations are due to cerebral action is doubtless true; but holding the view that where there is gray nerve-tissue, there nervous power is generated, the writer believes — and physiology and pathology fully support the opinion — that the spinal cord and sympathetic system are capable of originating certain kinds of mental influence, which, when the brain is quiescent, may be wonderfully intensified. The physiology of the nervous system is by no means even tolerably well understood. Science has for ages been fettered by theological and metaphysical dogmas, which give the mind an existence independent of the nervous system, and which teach that it is an entity which sets all the functions of the body in action, and of which the brain is the seat. There can be no scientific inquiry relative to matters of faith, — facts alone admit of investigation; and hence so long as psychology was expounded by teachers who had never even seen a human brain, much less a spinal-cord or sympathetic nerve, who knew absolutely nothing of nervous physiology, and who, therefore, taught from a stand-point which had not a single fact to rest

upon, it was not to be expected that the true science of mind could make much progress. It is different now, but the great mass of physiologists have scarcely yet thrown off the trammels of the past, and therefore, barely going a step in advance of Descartes, — who confounded the mind with the soul, and lodged it in the pineal gland, — they attribute all mental action to the brain alone.

Before we can be qualified to inquire into the powers of the mind, we must have a definite conception of what mind is. To express the idea in sufficiently full, but yet concise, language is difficult, and perhaps no definition can be given which will be entirely free from objection. For the purposes, however, of the present memoir, the mind may be regarded as a force the result of nervous action, and characterized by the ability to perceive sensations, to be conscious, to understand, to experience emotions, and to will in accordance therewith. Of these qualities consciousness resides exclusively in the brain, but the others, as is clearly shown by observation and experiment, cannot be restricted to this organ, but are developed with more or less intensity by other parts of the nervous system. It would be out of place to enter fully into the consideration of the important questions thus touched upon, but in the fact that the spinal cord and sympathetic ganglia are not devoid of mental power we find an explanation of some of the most striking phenomena of what is called spiritualism.

It has been supposed that magnetism — a force correlative with electricity — resides in the body, and that some persons are peculiarly sensitive to the influence of the magnet and to the magnetism evolved by other individuals. This subject has been thoroughly investigated by the Baron von Reichenbach, a very learned, but certainly a very imaginative man, who has developed from his inquiries some truth and a great deal of fancy. He sought to give an explanation of mesmerism, and really succeeded, to a certain extent. The following observation is certainly true: —

"If a strong magnet, capable of supporting about ten pounds, be drawn downwards over the bodies of fifteen or twenty persons, without actually touching them, some among them will always be found to be excited by it in a peculiar

manner. The number of people who are sensitive in this way is greater than is generally imagined. . . . . The kind of impression produced on these excitable people, who otherwise may be regarded as in perfect health, is scarcely describable; it is rather disagreeable than pleasant, and combined with a slight sensation of cold or warmth, resembling a cool or gently warm breath of air, which the patients imagine to blow softly upon them. Sometimes they feel sensations of drawing, pricking, or creeping; some complain of sudden attacks of headache. Not only women, but men in the very prime of life, are found distinctly susceptible to this influence; in children it is sometimes very active." *

Reichenbach supposed that these and other phenomena were due to a hitherto undescribed force which he denominated *od*, the *odic force*, or *odyle*, and which was present in the body. When evolved in large quantity, the subjects were said to be sensitive, and could then not only experience the sensations mentioned, but could also see the luminous flames which were asserted to be given off from the poles of a magnet. At first his experiments were conducted with confessedly sickly persons; but he subsequently ascertained that individuals in perfect health were capable of experiencing the same sensations. What the Baron's "perfect health" was will be apparent from the following remarks, which conclude his detailed description of thirty-five persons who were thus doubly gifted: —

"None of these perfectly healthy persons knew anything about their most remarkable and interesting peculiarities; and they were not a little astonished at the discovery, under my guidance, of powers of which they had never before dreamt. The manner in which I come upon the trace of them, which I at once take up and follow, is now simply this: I inquire among my acquaintance whether they know any one who is frequently troubled with periodical headaches, especially megrim, who complains of temporary oppression of the stomach, or who often sleeps badly without apparent cause, talks in the sleep, rises up or even gets out of bed, or is restless at night during the period of full moon, or to whom the moonlight in general

* Physico-Physiological Researches on the Dynamics of Magnetism, etc., p. 3. English translation, by Dr. John Ashburner. London. 1851.

is disagreeable, or who is readily disordered in churches or theatres, or very sensitive to strong smells, grating or shrill noises, etc., — all such persons, who may be otherwise healthy, I seek after, and make a pass with a finger over the palm of their hands, and scarcely ever miss finding them sensitive. When they follow me into the obscurity of my dark chamber and remain there an hour or two, their surprise is excited by the appearance of a quantity of luminous appearances, of which they had not previously the slightest idea. The number of persons who are in this state of excitability does actually exceed belief, and I state it rather below than above the reality when I say that at least a third part of the population are sensitive; for on every side on which I turn I meet with healthy sensitives; and I could in a few days collect, not dozens, but hundreds, if it were requisite. It will and must soon be proved how little ground there is to doubt these asseverations. Sensitiveness is not a rarity among human beings, as I myself thought some years ago, but a very generally distributed quality, which, after my accounts, will soon be discovered in every direction, and will throw open a new and not unimportant page of the human condition."

Can any physician conversant with the abnormal conditions of the nervous system doubt that such "healthy persons" as those described by the Baron von Reichenbach could be made, "under guidance," to see or feel almost anything suggested to them? The writer has now under his professional care a young lady, hysterical, a somnambulist, and affected with chorea, upon whom this principle of suggestion can be made to act with striking effect, and who would be a perfect godsend to all mesmerizers, mediums, and electro-biologists. For instance, it is only necessary to tell her that certain images are before her, when she directly sees them exactly as they are described; to inform her that she is about to have galvanism applied, and then to give her the unconnected poles, when she at once experiences the shock; to ask her if she has not a bitter or a sweet or a sour taste in her mouth, when she immediately declares that she has just such a taste as is mentioned. Voices are heard and odors smelt precisely as they are described to her. Hundreds of patients affected with diseases of the

nervous system are susceptible, in a greater or less degree, to the operation of suggestion; and to the action of this principle many miracles and impostures owe the success with which they have been received. To it many of the phenomena of spiritualism are clearly due.

But notwithstanding the fact that many of the experiments of the Baron von Reichenbach have no other foundation than that property of the human mind which causes it to be subjectively affected by suggestion, it is undoubtedly true that there is a germ of fact in his investigations, and that magnetism is destined to play an important part in physiology and pathology. In a strikingly original and interesting paper* just published, the experiments detailed in which have been verified by the writer, it is clearly shown that certain very obvious symptoms are induced by the application of a magnet to the body, and that the lower animals and even plants are indubitably affected by its influence.

But with all this there is no proof that magnetism or the odic force is capable under any circumstances of producing the clairvoyant state, of moving tables, of causing raps, or that any of the other more striking phenomena that are claimed for spiritualism can be accounted for through its agency. The *possibility* of such a power being exercised is quite another thing. The force that can cause a mass of iron to be moved in opposition to the laws of gravity, and through media impervious to all ordinary influences, can scarcely have the word *impossible* applied to it. But this is not a question of possibilities, but of facts, and certainly it has not been shown, with that reasonable degree of certainty which all scientific questions demand, that magnetism in or out of the body exercises any such control over mind or matter as has been claimed by its partisans.

The attention, when concentrated upon any particular thing or part of the body, will often lead to erroneous sensorial impressions. An observer gazing anxiously out to sea, or across a vast plain, will scarcely ever fail to see the object of which he is in search; an expectant watcher hears every moment the

* On the Physiological Action of Magnetism. By John Vansant, M. D., etc. Journal of Psychological Medicine, April, 1870.

rumbling of wheels, the footstep, or the knock which announces the wished-for or dreaded arrival; and pains, tastes, odors, and even diseases, can frequently be thus originated. Thus, a lady who has been under the professional care of the writer for intense nervous headaches, and who is of a very impressionable organization, is able at will to produce a pain in any part of her body by steadily fixing her attention upon it. Even the mention in her presence of physical suffering experienced by other persons immediately results in her feeling similar pains to those described, in corresponding parts of her own body. The case of Mrs. A., detailed by Sir David Brewster,* is a forcible illustration of the point in question.

Many of the facts of spiritualism are clearly explainable by referring them to this influence.

A still more important factor in the production of spiritualistic manifestations is sleight-of-hand. The perfection to which this art is carried by accomplished performers is really remarkable, and is much more wonderful than would be real visitations of spirits. The knowledge of human nature and of practical science requisite for some feats of legerdemain is necessarily very great, and the manipulations often require a degree of dexterity which cannot fail to excite astonishment. It is a well-known fact that the art in question can be satisfactorily made to explain many operations apparently supernatural, and that "mediums" do not hesitate to avail themselves of its resources. They are most of them, however, sorry performers, when compared with East Indian jugglers, and with some who make no secret of the fact that their performances are deceptions.

There is a condition known as somnambulism, into which persons of impressionable nervous systems are prone to pass, and which in such individuals may readily be induced by artificial means. In this state certain faculties and senses are intensely exalted, and if the attention can be concentrated upon any particular idea, circumstance, or object, great lucidity is manifested. On the other hand, there may be, and generally is, the most profound abstraction of mind in regard to all other ideas or things.

* Letters on Natural Magic addressed to Sir Walter Scott, Letter III.

The most thorough work on natural somnambulism is that of Bertrand,* published nearly fifty years ago, but which is still admirable for the truthful account of the various phenomena attendant upon the condition in question. Bertrand assigns somnambulism to four causes: —

1. A particular nervous temperament, which predisposes individuals otherwise in good health to paroxysms of somnambulism during their ordinary sleep.

2. It is sometimes produced in the course of certain diseases, of which it may be considered a symptom or a crisis.

3. It is often seen in the course of the proceeding necessary to bring on the condition known as animal magnetism.

4. It may result as a consequence of a high degree of mental exaltation. It is in this state contagious by imitation to such persons as are submitted to the same influence.

From these four categories of causes Bertrand distinguishes four kinds of somnambulism, — the natural, the symptomatic, the artificial, and the ecstatic. Under the artificial variety we must include Mr. Braid's hypnotism. In general terms, therefore, there are two kinds of somnambulism, the natural and the artificial. As an instance of the former condition, the following case is adduced from a recent monograph of the writer: † —

"A young lady of great personal attractions had the misfortune to lose her mother by death from cholera. Several other members of the family suffered from the disease, she alone escaping, though almost worn out with fatigue, excitement, and grief. A year after these events her father removed from the West to New York, bringing her with him and putting her at the head of his household. She had not been long in New York before she became affected with symptoms resembling those met with in chorea. The muscles of the face were in almost constant action; and though she had not altogether lost the power to control them by her will, it was difficult at times for her to do so. She soon began to talk in her sleep, and finally was found one night by her father as he came home endeavoring to open the street door. She was then, as he said, sound asleep, and had to be violently shaken to be aroused. After this she made the attempt every night

* Traité du Somnambulisme et des différentes Modifications qu'il présente. Paris. 1823.

† Sleep and its Derangements, p. 205. Philadelphia. 1869.

to get out of bed, but was generally prevented by a nurse who slept in the same room with her, and who was awakened by the noise she made. Her father now consulted me in regard to the case, and invited me to the house in order to witness the somnambulic acts for myself. One night, therefore, I went to his residence, and waited for the expected manifestations. The nurse had received orders not to interfere with her charge on this occasion, unless it was evident that injury would result, and to notify us of the beginning of the performance.

"About twelve o'clock she came down stairs and informed us that the young lady had risen from her bed and was about to dress herself. I went up stairs, accompanied by her father, and met her in the upper hall partly dressed. She was walking very slowly and deliberately, her head elevated, her eyes open, and her hands hanging loosely by her side. We stood aside to let her pass. Without noticing us, she descended the stairs to the parlor, we following her. Taking a match which she had brought with her from her own room, she rubbed it several times on the under side of the mantel-piece until it caught fire, and then turning on the gas, lit it. She next threw herself into an arm-chair and looked fixedly at a portrait of her mother which hung over the mantel-piece. While she was in this position I carefully examined her countenance, and performed several experiments, with the view of ascertaining the condition of the senses as to activity.

"She was very pale, more so than was natural to her; her eyes were wide open, and did not wink when the hand was brought suddenly in close proximity to them; the muscles of the face, which, when she was awake, were almost constantly in action, were now perfectly still; her pulse was regular in rhythm and force, and beat eighty-two per minute, and the respiration was uniform and slow.

"I held a large book between her eyes and the picture she was apparently looking at, so that she could not possibly see it. She nevertheless continued to gaze in the same direction as if no obstacle were interposed. I then made several motions as if about to strike her in the face. She made no attempt to ward off the blows, nor did she give the slightest sign that she saw my actions. I touched the corner of each eye with a lead-pencil I had in my hand, but even this did not make her close her eyelids. I was entirely satisfied that she did not see, at least with her eyes.

"I held a lighted sulphur match under her nose, so that she could not avoid inhaling the sulphurous acid gas which escaped. She gave no evidence of feeling any irritation. Cologne and other perfumes and smelling-salts likewise failed to make any obvious impression on her olfactory nerves.

"Through her partially opened mouth I introduced a piece of bread soaked in lemon-juice. She evidently failed to perceive the sour taste. Another piece of bread saturated with a solution of quinine was equally ineffectual. The two pieces remained in her mouth a full minute, and were then chewed and swallowed.

"She now arose from her chair and began to pace the room in an agitated manner; she wrung her hands, sobbed, and wept violently. While she was acting in this way, I struck two books together several times so as to make loud noises close to her ears. This failed to interrupt her.

"I then took her by the hand and led her back to the chair in which she had previously been sitting. She made no resistance, but sat down quietly and soon became perfectly calm.

"Scratching the back of her hand with a pin, pulling her hair, and pinching her face appeared to excite no sensation.

"I then took off her slippers and tickled the soles of her feet. She at once drew them away, but no laughter was produced. As often as this experiment was repeated the feet were drawn up. The spinal cord was therefore awake.

"She had now been down stairs about twenty minutes. Desiring to awake her, I shook her by the shoulders quite violently for several seconds without success. I then took her head between my hands and shook it. This proved effectual in a little while. She awoke suddenly, looked around her for an instant, as if endeavoring to comprehend her situation, and then burst into a fit of hysterical sobbing. When she recovered her equanimity, she had no recollection of anything that had passed, or of having had a dream of any kind."

This case illustrates very well some of the principal phenomena of natural somnambulism. Many others are on record which, in many respects, are more remarkable, but it is scarcely necessary to refer to them here at greater length.

Now it has long been known that somnambulism can be artificially induced. Even before the time of Mesmer there were occasional illustrations of this fact; but Puysegur is entitled to the credit of being the first to systematize them and to practise the art of producing factitious somnambulism. He caused it by passes, and finally, it is claimed, by simple acts of the will. The Abbé Faria induced it by shouting, and Barberin by praying! Other methods were also employed; and as its identity with mesmerism became generally recog-

nized, it had ascribed to it the name of mesmeric or magnetic sleep.

No one has more thoroughly investigated the nature of artificial somnambulism than Mr. Braid,* who gives the following as his ordinary method of procedure: —

"Take any bright object (I generally use my lancet-case) between the thumb and fore and middle fingers of the left hand, hold it from eight to fifteen inches from the eyes at such position above the forehead as may be necessary to produce the greatest possible strain upon the eyes and eyelids, and enable the patient to maintain a steady, fixed stare at the object. It will generally be found that the eyelids close with a *vibratory* motion, or become spasmodically closed. After ten or fifteen seconds have elapsed, by gently elevating the arms and legs it will be found that the patient has a disposition to retain them in the situation in which they have been placed, if he is intensely affected. If this is not the case, desire him to retain the limbs in the extended position, and thus the pulse will speedily become greatly accelerated, and the limbs in process of time will become quite rigid and involuntarily fixed. It will also be found that all the organs of special sense, excepting sight, including heat and cold and muscular motion or resistance, are *at first* prodigiously *exalted*, such as happens with regard to the primary effects of opium, wine, and spirits. After a certain point, however, this exaltation of function is followed by a state of depression far greater than the torpor of *natural* sleep. From the state of the most profound torpor of the organs of special sense and tonic rigidity of the muscles, they may at this stage *instantly* be restored to the *opposite* condition of extreme mobility and exalted sensibility, by directing a current of air against the organ or organs we wish to excite to action or the muscles we wish to render limber, and which had been in this cataleptiform state. By mere repose the senses will speedily merge into the original condition again."

Mr. Braid gives examples of this artificial somnambulism or hypnotism, as he designates it, which show that its phenomena are identical with those of natural somnambulism, and that it covers much that is alleged to be due to animal magnetism and modern spiritualism. He found the same condition to be produced though he left the room, if the subject followed his direc-

* Neurypnology, or the Rationale of Nervous Sleep, considered in Relation with Animal Magnetism, etc. London. 1843.

tions, so that there could be no suspicion that he acted through the medium of any force emanating from his body.

The persons who most readily come into the hypnotic condition are of the same class as those who were such favorable subjects for the odic force of Von Reichenbach, and who now make the best mediums. The writer has very carefully investigated this division of the subject, and has made many experiments in regard to it, which leave no doubt in his mind that the relation really exists. As an illustration of the character of the phenomena, the following case is adduced. He does not doubt that the thoughtful reader will at once see that if such a person as the one whose actions while in the hypnotic state are described should be disposed to deceive, or should be under the control of designing or ignorant individuals, she would not fail to be received by many as a medium of the first order.

A short time after writing the account of the young lady whose case has just been quoted as an example of natural somnambulism, I was informed by her father that her affection, which had been cured by suitable medical treatment, had returned, owing, as he supposed, to excessive mental exertion, she having contracted a taste for philosophy, in the study of which she had indulged to a great extent.

Upon examination I found that she not only had paroxysms of natural somnambulism, but that she had acquired the power of inducing the hypnotic state at will. Her process was to take up some one of the philosophical works, select a paragraph which required intense thought or excited powerful emotion, read it, close the book, fix her eyes steadily, but not directing the foci so as to see any particular object, and then reflect deeply upon what she had read. From the revery thus occasioned she gradually passed into the somnambulic condition. During this state it was said she answered questions correctly, read books held behind her, described scenes passing in distant places, and communicated messages from the dead. She therefore possessed in every essential respect the qualifications of either a clairvoyant or a spiritualistic medium, according to the peculiar tenets of belief held by the faithful.

In accordance with my request, she proceeded to put herself

into the hypnotic state. With a volume of Plato in her hand, she read thus from the Apology of Socrates. Her voice was calm and impressive, as though she felt every word she uttered: —

"Moreover, we may hence conclude that there is great hope that death is a blessing. For to die is one of two things: for either the dead may be annihilated and have no sensation of anything whatever; or, as it is said, there is a certain change and passage of the soul from one place to another. And if it is a privation of all sensation, as it were a sleep in which the sleeper has no dream, death would be a wonderful gain. For I think that if any one having selected a night in which he slept so soundly as not to have had a dream, and having compared this night with all the other nights and days of his life, should be required on consideration to say how many days and nights he had passed better and more pleasantly than this night throughout his life, I think that not only a private person, but even the great king himself, would find them easy to number in comparison with other days and nights. If, therefore, death is a thing of this kind, I say it is a gain; for thus all futurity appears to be nothing more than one night."

As she reached the close her voice became inexpressibly sad, the book dropped from her hand, her eyes were fixed on vacancy, her hands lay quietly in her lap, her breath came irregularly, and tears were flowing down her cheeks. Her pulse, which before she began to read was eighty-four per minute, was now one hundred and eight. As her abstraction became more profound it fell, till when she was unconscious, three minutes after she ceased reading, it was only seventy-two.

To satisfy myself that she was completely hypnotized, I held a bottle of strong *aqua ammoniæ* to her nostrils. She did not evince the slightest degree of sensibility. Touching the eye with the finger — a test that a person practising deception could not have borne — equally failed to afford the least response indicative of sensation. I was therefore satisfied that she was in the condition of artificial somnambulism.

To describe in detail all that took place would lengthen unduly this paper; such parts, therefore, as are material, and which illustrate essential points, will alone be given.

The writer asked her if there were any spirits in the room.

"Yes."

"Whose spirits are they?"

"The spirit of Socrates is here, the spirit of Plato, the spirit of Schleiermacher." (She had been reading before my arrival "Schleiermacher's Introductions to the Dialogues of Plato.")

"Do you not also see the spirit of Schenkelfürst?"

This was a *ruse*, there being no such person.

"Schenkelfürst?" she asked.

"Yes; he was Schleiermacher's constant companion and friend."

"Schenkelfürst," she repeated; "what a singular name!"

She was silent for a moment, and then her face was lit up with a smile, and she exclaimed: —

"I see him; he is a small, dark man, with sharp piercing eyes; he wears a coat trimmed with fur; he approaches Schleiermacher; they embrace; they are talking to each other."

"Will not Schleiermacher send some message through you?"

"No, he has gone away with his friend."

"Will no other spirit communicate?"

"Yes, there is one coming now; a man with a mournful face; his name is Bruno, — Giordano Bruno. He speaks; he says, 'O my friends, be of good cheer; there is no end, even as there has been no beginning; the weak-hearted fall from the ranks and for a time are lost; but as there is a portion of the divinity in all God's creatures, even they are regenerated.'"

She stopped, and then in a low voice said, while tears streamed down her cheeks: —

"*Majori forsitan cum timore sententiam in me fertis quam ego accipiam*," — the words used by Bruno when sentence of death was pronounced upon him. She had finished reading his life a few weeks before.

Desiring to change the current of her thoughts and also to test her powers of prevision, she was asked who would be the first patient to enter the office of the writer that day week, and with what disease would he or she be affected?

She answered promptly: —

"A gentleman from Albany, I see him now; he is thin and pale, and very weak; he is lame, I think he is paralyzed."

The first person in reality who entered the office on the day in question was a lady of New York, suffering from nervous headache.

She was then asked where her father was at that moment (4.10 P. M.). Her answer was: "At the corner of Wall Street and Broadway; he is looking at the clock on Trinity Church; he is waiting for a stage." During the hour between four o'clock and five her father was in Brooklyn.

A table with paper was now placed before her, a pencil put into her hand, and she was requested again to place herself *en rapport* with some spirit. She immediately began to write as follows: "Let all the world hear my voice and follow the precepts I inculcate. There are many fools and but few wise. I write for the former, and am probably a fool myself, for I constantly see a chasm yawning at my side; and though my intellect tells me there is no chasm near me, I place a screen so that I cannot see it. PASCAL." She had that very day been reading a memoir of Pascal, in which the hallucination referred to was mentioned.

The following conversation then took place: —

"Where are you now?"

"In New York."

"No, you are in a vessel at sea; there is a terrible storm; are you not afraid?"

"Yes, I am very much frightened; what shall I do? O, save me, save me!"

She wrung her hands, screamed with terror, rose from her chair and paced the room, apparently suffering intensely from fear. In the midst of her agitation she awoke, and it was not without difficulty that the impression she had received could be removed.

On a subsequent occasion her somnambulic powers of vision were tested by asking her to read the writing on a slip of paper; to tell the time marked by a watch held to the back of her head; to read a particular line from a closed book, etc.; but though she always made some answer, she was never once right. The senses of touch and of hearing were the only ones she appeared to be capable of exercising, and these were not in any degree exalted in their action. Conjoined

with integrity of touch there was well-marked *analgesia*, or inability to feel pain. Thus, though able to tell the shape, texture, and consistence of objects placed in her hands, she experienced no sensation when a pin was thrust into the calf of her leg, or when a coal of fire was held in close proximity to any part of her body.

It will readily be perceived, therefore, that certain parts of her nervous system were in a state of inaction, were in fact dormant, while others remained capable of receiving sensations and originating nervous influence. Her sleep was therefore incomplete. Images were formed, hallucinations entertained, and she was accordingly in these respects in a condition similar to that of a dreaming person; for the images and hallucinations were either directly connected with thoughts she had previously had, or were immediately suggested to her through her sense of hearing. Some mental faculties were exercised, whilst others were quiescent. There was no correct judgment and no volition. Imagination, memory, the emotions, and *the ability to be impressed by suggestions*, were present in a high degree.

Now the writer is satisfied, from a careful study of this lady's case, and of others similar to it in general character which have come under his observation, that the phenomena of hypnotism are not those of pure somnambulism, but that three other conditions are present in greater or less degree. These are hysteria, catalepsy, and ecstasy. To a brief consideration of some of the more important features of these abnormal states of the nervous system the attention of the reader is invited, with the expectation that they will be found to account for many of the phenomena of spiritualism.

There is a strong tendency, in all persons affected with hysteria, to the occurrence of symptoms which simulate organic diseases. Paralysis, both of motion and of sensation, is one of the morbid conditions thus assumed. This tendency is not generally voluntary, though undoubtedly cases are not infrequent in which the simulation is clearly intentional, and others more numerous in which volition, when brought to bear with full force upon the disposition, will overcome it. In these latter cases there is, as it were, a paralysis of the will. In

other instances hysterical persons will deliberately enter upon a systematic course of deception and fraud, more, apparently, for the sake of attracting attention and obtaining notoriety than from any other motive.

Thus an hysterical woman will suddenly take to her bed and declare that she has no feeling and no power of motion in her leg or arm. The most careful examination shows that she is speaking the truth. Pins may be thrust into the affected limb, it may be pinched or scorched *ad libitum*, and yet the possessor does not wince. A somewhat analogous state exists in us all at times. When the mind is intensely occupied or the passions greatly aroused, there is the same insensibility to pain. Many a soldier has not discovered his wound till the heat of the battle was over.

Now when great mental exaltation is induced in an hysterical person we find this analgesic condition developed to its utmost extent. Under these combined influences weak girls have submitted to all kinds of maltreatment and suffered no pain, and have been able to resist blows and other bodily injuries which in their normal condition would have caused death. Thus it is stated by Montgeron,* in his account of the Jansenist Convulsionnaires, that some women gave themselves severe blows with iron instruments in such a manner that sharp points were forced into the flesh. Fouillou states that another had herself hung up by the heels with the head downward, and remained in this position three quarters of an hour. One day as she lay extended on her bed two men who held a cloth under her back raised her up and threw her forward two thousand four hundred times while two other persons placed in front thrust her back. Another day four men having taken hold of her by the extremities began to pull her, each with all his strength, and she was thus dragged in different directions for the space of some minutes. She caused herself to be tied one day as she lay on the table, her arms crossed behind her back and her legs flexed to their fullest extent, and, while six men struck her without ceasing, a seventh choked her. After this she remained insen-

* La Vérité des Miracles, Tom. II. 1737. Quoted by Calmeil, De la Folie, etc. Paris. 1845.

sible for some time, and her tongue, inflamed and discolored, hung far out of her mouth. Another insisted upon receiving a hundred blows upon the stomach with an andiron, and these were so heavy that they shook the wall against which she was placed, and upon one occasion a breach in it was caused at the twenty-fifth blow.

A physician, hearing of these things, insisted that they could not be true, as it was physically impossible that the skin, the flesh, the bones, and the internal organs could resist such violence. He was told to come and verify the facts. He hastened to do so, and was struck with astonishment. Scarcely believing his eyes, he begged to be allowed to administer the blows. A strong iron instrument, sharp at one end, was put into his hands; he struck with all his might and thrust it deep into the flesh, but the victim laughed at his efforts, and remarked that his blows only did her good.

This immunity from injury, though remarkable, is frequently met with among hysterical persons at the present day, but is much more frequently assumed. Calmeil * states that many of the Jansenist fanatics were subject to great illusions on this point; for many among them exhibited very obvious effects of the treatment, such as patches of discoloration on the skin, and innumerable contusions on the parts which had suffered the most severe assaults. Then it must be remembered that the blows upon the belly were given while the paroxysms were present, and when the stomach and intestines were distended with wind, — a condition almost inseparable from the hysterical state. The prize-fighters of our own day, by filling the chest with air, endure blows which untrained persons could not receive without serious injury.

The writer has had the opportunity of witnessing many manifestations of hysteria analogous in character to those described in the foregoing remarks. Upon one occasion a young woman, a patient in the wards of the Pennsylvania Hospital, began a series of movements consisting in bending her body backwards till it formed an arch, her heels and head alone resting on the bed, and then, suddenly straightening herself out, would fall heavily. Instantly the arch was formed again;

* *Op. cit.*, Tom. II. p. 386.

again she fell; and this process was kept up with inconceivable rapidity for several hours every day. In another instance, a lady, during an access of hysterical paroxysms to which she was liable, beat her head with such violence against a lath-and-plaster partition, that she made a hole in it, while little or no injury was inflicted on herself. In another, a girl eighteen years of age lay down on the floor, naked, and made all the members of her family, five in number, stand each in turn for several minutes on her abdomen. In another, a lady, in order that she might resemble those martyrs who suffered on the rack, tied her wrists with a stout cord, mounted a step-ladder, fastened the cord to a hook in the wall, and then, jumping from the ladder, succeeded in dislocating her shoulder. It would be easy to go on and quote hundreds of other instances of hysterical folly with which monographs on the subject abound.

In a recent work,* which may certainly be regarded as good spiritualistic authority, there is an account of a medium who was by turns under the influence of a good spirit, called "Katy," and of a bad one, whom she asserted to be a "sailor-boy." This latter took great delight in swearing through her, and in uttering such profane language as he had been accustomed to use on earth. Many manifestations of the power of both these spirits were given, until, to quote the words of the narrator, —

"About 1846 a most singular and distressing phase of these phenomena was superadded to the rest, under what claimed to be the influence of the profane sailor. The girl's limbs in several directions would be thrown out of joint, and that with apparent ease, in a moment, and without pain. To replace them seemed to be either beyond the power or the will of her invisible tormentor, and Dr. Larkin [a weak-minded man whose servant she was], though an experienced surgeon, was often obliged to call in the aid of his professional brethren and two or three strong assistants.

"On one occasion the knees and wrists of the girl were thrown out of joint twice in a single day. These painful feats were always accom-

* Modern American Spiritualism: a Twenty Years' Record of the Communion between Earth and the World of Spirits (p. 159). By Emma Hardinge. Second edition. New York. 1870.

panied by loud laughter, hoarse and profane jokes, and expressions of exultant delight purporting to come from the sailor, whilst the girl herself seemed wholly unconscious of the danger of her awkward situation. The preternatural feats of agility and strength exhibited on these occasions could scarcely be credited, and the frightfully unnatural contortions of the limbs, with which she became tied up into knots and coils, baffles all physiological explanation or attempts at description."

Can any person familiar with the vagaries of hysteria doubt for an instant that this girl was suffering from it, and that her condition was aggravated by the notoriety which she gained by her performances? In what respect do these so-called spiritualistic performances differ from those which have been cited?

From the same volume* the following account is taken:—

"Four silly, badly educated girls, of ages ranging from fifteen to twenty, having gathered together at a friend's house to 'have a time with the spirits,' or in other words to trifle with spiritual manifestations, seated themselves around a table, and, after asking all manner of foolish questions, requested the spirits to take hold of them.

"The spirits at once complied; seized them, treated them in the roughest manner, and, shaking them, caused them to use the most violent actions and outrageous language, etc. In this strait one of the dignitaries of the mother church was sent for in haste to 'expel the obsessing demons.' After the priest had arrived at the scene of disorder, he put on his robes, got ready the holy water, and approached the possessed girls in the due formulæ proper to such occasions. After many sallies with the holy fluid, and a vast number of incantations, none of which produced the slightest effect, the mediums at length charged upon him with such irresistible power and such capacity of finger-nails, that the worthy *padre* fled precipitately, leaving the field in possession of the 'demons' and the spectators who had gathered together to witness the 'exorcism.' The girls still continued to be used roughly by the discordant spirits they had invoked until the arrival of some of their spiritualistic friends, by whose judicious passes and gentle remonstrances with the spirits, they were instantly relieved."

That these "silly, badly educated girls" were simply hysterical, no one with even a superficial acquaintance with the normal condition of the nervous system, and the aberrations to which it may be subjected, can entertain the slightest doubt.

* *Op. cit.*, p. 271.

It is from just such persons as these that the best mediums are obtained. That such phenomena as they and the girl whose case was previously quoted exhibited are regarded as spiritualistic, is sufficient of itself to throw discredit on all the other alleged manifestations of the spirits. "*Falsum in uno, falsum in omnibus.*"

In catalepsy we have an affection which is well calculated to fulfil many of the requirements of spiritualism. It is characterized by suspension of the understanding and of sensibility, and by a tendency in the muscles to preserve any degree of contraction which may be given them. Thus, if the arm of a cataleptic patient be extended, it remains so for several minutes; if the leg be raised from the bed, the muscles continue to keep it in that position till they become thoroughly exhausted, when it sinks slowly down. Its causes are very similar to those which induce hysteria, with which it is closely allied and often blended. Among them emotional disturbance, a peculiar condition of the nervous system called by the French *Nervosisme*, hereditary influence, excessive mental exertion, imitation, and a desire for notoriety are the chief.

During the cataleptic condition, sensation is generally suspended. Pins can be thrust into the body and they are not felt, and even more severe injuries are not perceived; the eyes do not see, though the eyelids may be open; loud noises are not heard, penetrating odors are not smelt, or strongly sapid substances tasted. In uncomplicated catalepsy consciousness is lost; but in the mixed forms, which are much more common, the intellectual faculties are often exercised to a remarkable extent. Besides its hysterical affinities, catalepsy is correlative with ecstasy (a modified form), chorea, somnambulism, and epilepsy, and may pass by insensible gradations into either of these diseases.

In the less perfectly developed forms of the cataleptic condition the affected individuals, though taking no cognizance of the circumstances surrounding them, are capable of a certain exalted esoteric mental action, which passes with the vulgar for illumination, inspiration, or spiritualization. Chambers * quotes from Dr. Haen the case of a child twelve years old who began

* Reynolds's System of Medicine, p. 104; *art.* Catalepsy.

a paroxysm by being cataleptic and ended by reciting the metrical Protestant version of David's Psalms, saying her Catechism with proof-texts, and preaching a sermon on adultery.

A young girl recently under the professional care of the writer was cataleptic on an average once a week, and epileptic twice or three times in the intervals. Five years previously she had spent six months in France, but had not acquired more than a very slight knowledge of the language, scarcely, in fact, sufficient to enable her to ask for what she wanted at her meals. Immediately before her cataleptic seizures she went into a state of ecstasy, during which she recited poetry in French and delivered harangues about virtue and godliness, in the same language. She pronounced at these times exceedingly well, and seemed never at a loss for a word. To all surrounding influences she was apparently dead. But she sat bolt upright in her chair, her eyes staring at vacancy, and her organs of speech in constant action. Gradually she passed into the cataleptic paroxysm. She was an excellent example of what Mrs. Hardinge calls a "trance medium." The materialistic influence of bromide of potassium, however, cured her of her catalepsy and epilepsy, destroyed her knowledge of the French tongue, and made her corporeal structure so gross that the spirits refused to make further use of it for their manifestations.

Among celebrated cataleptics and ecstatics may be mentioned Elizabeth of Hungary, St. Gertrude, St. Bridget, St. Catherine of Sienna, Joan of Arc, St. Theresa, Madame Guyon, and Joanna Southcote. The conventual life was especially favorable to the production of all the forms of catalepsy, and sometimes, as in the instance of the nuns of Loudun, the disease assumed a malignancy which all the power of the Church could not abate.

It is a striking fact, which would be laughable but for the frequently lamentable results which ensued, that while the Catholic ecstatics inveighed against the heretical sects which were springing up on all sides, and consigned them to torture and the flames, these, the Calvinists, Camisards, Preadamites, Jumpers, Anabaptists, Quakers, Methodists, Tremblers, etc., etc., denounced the Pope as anti-Christ, desecrated churches, and

exhibited a ferocity which in its sanguinary character has rarely been equalled.

Now, as has already been remarked, in the imperfect forms of catalepsy or ecstasy consciousness is not altogether lost. Montgeron noticed this fact, and in speaking of persons affected says they generally see those who are about them, speak to them, and hear their answers, though at the same time their minds are apparently entirely absorbed in the contemplation of objects which a superior power enables them to see. It must be recollected that Montgeron was a believer in the supernatural origin of these manifestations of disease. At the present day he would have been a shining light among spiritualists.

He further observes, that in these undeveloped forms of the disorder, as noticed among the Jansenist Convulsionnaires, the affected individuals appeared as if struck by the sight of some object before unseen, and the contemplation of which filled them with the most ravishing joy. They raised their eyes and their hands on high, leaped towards heaven, and seemed as if about to fly into the air. They appeared to be absorbed in the contemplation of celestial beauties. Their faces were animated with a brilliant glow, and their eyes, which could not be closed during the continuance of the ecstasy, remained open and fixed on the spiritualized object upon which they gazed. They were in a manner transfigured; they appeared to be perfectly unlike their natural selves. Those who ordinarily were low and repulsive were changed so profoundly that they could not be recognized.

About fifty years ago a very remarkable case of preaching ecstasy, or, as it would now be called by some, "trance mediumship," occurred in this city in the person of a maiden lady of delicate health, named Rachel Baker. Dr. S. L. Mitchill took great interest in her case, and had her sermons reported by a stenographer and published. Miss Baker was the daughter of a respectable farmer in Onondaga County, New York, and had received a plain but substantial education. About the age of twenty her mind became much exercised on the subject of religion, and at length her health became seriously affected, and she fell into the habit of trance preaching. Her parents were at first surprised at what they regarded as a

most extraordinary gift, though they afterwards became convinced that it was the result of disease, and accordingly brought her to the city of New York, in order that she might have the benefit of the best medical skill. Crowds flocked to hear her preach in this city, at the houses of different medical practitioners. Her discourses were highly respectable in point of style and arrangement, and were interspersed with Scripture quotations. After her health was restored, she lost her faculty of trance preaching, and never regained it. She died in 1843.*

At all times during the historic period two classes of individuals have been concerned in the propagation of false ideas relative to the phenomena which it is now attempted to impose upon the world as produced by the agency of spirits. These are the deceivers and the deceived. Whether as priests, witches, magicians, mesmerizers, somnambulists, ecstatics, hysterical persons, or mediums, the first are deceivers; some of them honest, but by far the greater number guilty of intentional fraud. Whether subject to illusions, hallucinations, or delusions, weak-minded or ignorant, the second are deceived.

In the foregoing pages the writer has attempted to give an outline view of some of the causes which produce many so-called supernatural manifestations and which lead to their acceptance by certain classes of individuals. To describe in detail all the vagaries of spiritualism would be a fruitless undertaking. He has witnessed many spiritualistic performances, and has never seen a single one which could not be accounted for by the operation of some one or more of the causes specified. No medium has ever yet been lifted into the air by spirits, no one has ever read unknown writing through a closed envelope, no one has ever lifted tables or chairs but by material agencies, no one has ever been tied or untied by spirits, no one has ever heard the knock of a spirit, and no one has ever spoken through the power of a spirit other than his own.

Even if bodies had been raised in the air by agencies unexplainable, even if some one had read writing through several thicknesses of paper, even if others had been bound and un-

* Copland's Dictionary of Medicine (American edition), Vol. I.; *art.* Catalepsy, note by Dr. C. A. Lee.

bound in a way unknown to us, even if knocks had been heard whose sources could not be ascertained, even if the causes of all the phenomena of spiritualism were entirely beyond our present knowledge, there would be no proof that spirits had anything to do with them. On the contrary, the hypothesis of spirits is altogether the least plausible which could be suggested. The phenomena and the explanation have nothing in common.

Spiritualism is a religion. As such it is held tenaciously and honestly by many well-meaning people. To reason with these would be a waste of words, just as much as would be the attempt to persuade a madman out of his delusion. Emotion or interest or accident might change them, but facts never. But there are some who halt between belief and unbelief, for the reason mainly that they have no clear conception of what knowledge is, and of how things are to be proved. For these there can be no more striking truths than the following account of Algazzali's description of his search for actual knowledge: —

"The true source of casual beliefs is the authority of parents and preceptors. Now there are many methods of comprehending the differences which exist between things received on the faith of such authority and the principles of the things themselves. There exist likewise many means of distinguishing the true from the false. For this reason I said to myself in the very beginning of my inquiry, 'My object is simply to know the truth of things, consequently it is indispensable to seek for that which constitutes knowledge.' Now it is evident to me that certain knowledge ought to be that which explains the object to be known, so that there can be no doubt, and that all error and all conjecture would be henceforth impossible. And not only then the understanding would not need to make efforts to arrive at certainty, but the security against error ought to be in so intimate a connection with the thing known for certain, that even when an apparent proof of its falsity is produced, — as, for example, if a man should transform a stone into gold or a stick into a serpent, — no error should be caused, or even the suspicion of error rendered possible. If when I have satisfied myself that ten is more than three, some one should say to me, 'Not so, on the contrary three is more than ten, and to prove to you the truth of my assertion I will transform this rod into a snake'; if then he should so transform it to my entire conviction, the certainty I should have of his error would not be shaken. His

performance would produce in me only an admiration for his skill, but I should not doubt the truth I had acquired.

"Then I was convinced that all knowledge which I did not possess in this manner, and of which I had not this kind of certitude, could inspire me with neither confidence nor assurance, and that all knowledge without assurance is not a sure knowledge." *

How little the phenomena of spiritualism are reconcilable with the tests laid down by Algazzali every candid, intelligent, and educated inquirer knows.

WILLIAM A. HAMMOND.

ART. II. — *The Discovery of the Great West.* By FRANCIS PARKMAN, Author of "Pioneers of France in the New World," and "The Jesuits in North America." Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. 1869. 12mo. pp. 425.

IN this volume Mr. Parkman renews, and most effectively vindicates, his claim as an historian of a high order, alike from the dignity and interest of his theme, and from the thoroughness, ability, and power of sympathy with which he has treated it. With rare persistency of purpose and unwearied researches, in spite of physical drawbacks and the penalties visited in his case upon intellectual labor, he has steadily wrought upon the rich and fresh theme whose promise and attractions he recognized more than a quarter of a century ago. His whole subject is, the history of French enterprise, exploration, discovery, colonization, and dominion in North America. This theme he might have dealt with continuously, in chronological order, keeping up the thread of his narrative and disposing his biographical sketches and the episodes of his story into the chapters and volumes of a work under one comprehensive title. The other, the preferable method as he has proved, was to make separate works from the leading characters and episodes of the whole subject. The history of French enterprise on this con-

* Essai sur les Écoles philosophiques chez les Arabes et notamment sur la Doctrine d'Algazzali. Par Auguste Schmölders, Docteur en Philosophie. Paris. 1842.

tinent presents just such distinct and salient incidents and themes as would naturally invite and favor the latter method of dealing with them. Mr. Parkman does not mention on his title-page his "Conspiracy of Pontiac," which, though the first in the series of his historical publications, is concerned with the tragic incidents of the last struggles of France for dominion on our northern and western borders. But that work must, of course, be regarded as marking the limit of his subject, and the remaining space was to be filled, as in such large measure it has been, by the three volumes which have followed it, and by the promise of the next, which is to treat of the struggles of monarchy and feudalism under Louis for permanent sway on this continent.

When an author undertakes a work of such extent and of so exacting a character, having in view our modern standard for the composition of history, namely, that the subject should be in itself deserving of an elaborate treatment, and that it should be faithfully wrought out of authentic materials of the first value, it is easy to measure the degree of his success, and consequently to estimate our obligations to him. We have only to regard the amount and relative value of the literature of the subject previously accessible to us, and fairly to appreciate the addition which the new writer has made to the sum and accuracy of our knowledge about his subject, and the new attractions of style, method, and illustration which he has given to it.

There was a remarkable and grievous deficiency in our historical literature on all that related to the course and incidents of French colonization on this continent, whether regard be had to the subject in its comprehensive relations or the special themes of Mr. Parkman's volumes. There is no question but that French enterprise, not to say accomplishments, in colonial exploration and missionary efforts, may claim precedence over that of all other nationalities in the New World. If the allotments of success and power and permanent possession were made in human affairs in consistency with our ordinary estimates of what is fair and reasonable, the French empire would now be holding permanent possession of the larger portion of the territory of the United States and of British America. And this would of right be so, not because France ever as a government organized and administered a costly,

complicated, and persistent expedition or system of measures for exploring and colonizing the continent, for no European government ever did that, even approximately. It was not the fashion of governments two centuries ago to devise and support commissions for such purposes. But the French explorers had a semi-official patronage from their monarch and his ministers; they were backed by large pecuniary supplies from men in power and by civil and religious corporations; and, more than all, they practically did the work of opening the wilderness to the knowledge and civilization of Europe. The English colonists of New England seem to have never been urged by the impulses of curiosity or interest to any efforts to explore the interior of the continent. A single expedition into the wilds of New Hampshire to trace the upper waters of the Merrimack, in order to settle the disputed question of the bounds of the Massachusetts patent, is all that our records recognize of Puritan enterprise in the work of exploration. The Dutch, in their fort at the head of tide-waters on the Hudson, had established a few trucking-places along the valley of the Mohawk, but their adventure stopped within those limits. French navigators, Cartier, Champlain, and their companions and successors, made successive voyages with redoubled efforts, and renewed supplies for the purpose of obtaining a permanent and ever-extending dominion on our northern boundaries; and they affiliated with the natives in the common interests of commerce, while Jesuits and Récollets held their own jealous rivalries in check at the prompting of religious zeal for the conversion of the savages to the Church. Then a series of costly and arduous expeditions was organized under able men, burghers and nobles, for opening the depths of the continent and bringing its capacities of wealth and the glory of its possession under the single sway of France. The preliminary work was in fact accomplished while English and Dutch settlers on or near the Atlantic border were content with clearing the forests and profiting by the tillage and the trade within their limited confines. The French were the real explorers of our territory. The rivers, headlands, bays, lakes, and portages on our Canadian and Western frontiers all received either a French name or a French reproduction of their Indian appellations. Till the period of the French

war there was scarce a backwoodsman, or a straggler from civilization, to be found beyond our settlements, who was not a Frenchman, or a half-breed of that lineage. Yet France has nothing of empire now to show within these vast territories. Her Northern and Western possessions, protected by a chain of forts, were wrenched from her in war, and she parted with the last portion of her domain at the South for money.

If then only history, only a record of bold designs, of heroic efforts and tragic catastrophes, remains to France of her enterprise and achievements on this continent, all the more reason is there that this history should be written and illustrated with fidelity and genius. It has never yet been adequately dealt with, but if it has been waiting for a competent and willing narrator, it has found one in Mr. Parkman. Of course, on this subject, as on all others of similar importance and interest, there was already a somewhat voluminous and varied literature, and a vast number of published documents of fragmentary and partial character. But the defects and imperfections and errors, which are peculiarly grave and misleading in all that we had in print on this large theme, would have rendered any work which was confined to a re-editing or digesting of these materials wholly unsatisfactory. The unpublished documents, letters, papers, journals, and official records, now scattered widely, now preserved with care or jealousy in public archives or in private repositories, have in their trust the true history, especially of such actors and enterprises as enter into this range of narrations. A rude map or outline, a municipal register, a muster-roll, a notary's process, an ecclesiastical or marine or judicial entry minuted on an otherwise valueless paper, may settle one of the most important facts on which a critical question turns. It was by intelligent and patient search for such materials of truthful history that Mr. Parkman qualified himself for his undertaking. The personal inquisition that he has made for them in France and Rome and Canada, and the expense requisite for procuring copies of an immense mass of them, accrue to the benefit of each of us who reads his volumes in the quiet and comfort of his evening fire or under the shadow of his piazza. It may be well for such readers, while exercising their imaginations about the intrepid characters and

the wild scenes presented in Mr. Parkman's pages, to give a thought to his own elaborate and conscientious efforts to qualify himself as a narrator. Not the least among his qualifications is the knowledge which he has reached, by personal visits and inquiries, of the regions and the localities which were the scenes of his histories. But most of all we must account among his special capacities for his work his own native taste, his aptitude, and his acquired skill for dealing with the scenery and the conditions of wilderness life, and with the characteristics and habits of the aborigines.

Though La Salle, the hero of the great enterprise to which Mr. Parkman devotes the present volume, used his honest and skilful pen to good purpose, he put nothing into print. Some of his associates and subordinates who were in the main friendly to him, as well as many who were hostile to him, or represented rival interests, were directly or indirectly the authors of several publications. Supposing all these to be truthful, or intended to be so in their contents, — a supposition which is quite wide of the facts in this case, — these publications would necessarily fall far short of serving as authorities, unless used by an historian who could go behind them all, with independent knowledge and a faculty of penetrating the secrets which such documents would be unlikely to reveal, even if they made no attempts to hide or to misinterpret. There is much actual perversion and falsification in many of those documents. The stout and on the whole deserving Father Hennepin, one of the readier scribes of the expedition, — the first white man who described from eyesight the Falls of Niagara and of St. Antony, — was, as Mr. Parkman entitles him, a great liar. He seems to have had the same facility and ingenuity which prompted the more famous Captain John Smith to introduce wholly new and inconsistent statements in successive narrations of his adventures. Intrigue and the fierce clashing of rival pecuniary and religious interests and schemes form the warp and woof alike of the published and the manuscript materials for this history. To inform himself fully about all these jealousies requires wide research on the part of a modern writer; and to be able to trace his way wisely through them is a serious demand upon his discretion and candor.

Besides the full exercise of his own efforts in qualifying himself for his task and in the gathering of resources, Mr. Parkman has had a most efficient and valuable helper in M. Pierre Margry, assistant custodian of the Archives of the Marine and Colonies at Paris, himself a most laborious and successful worker in the mine of French history and in some departments of our own. Likewise family papers of La Salle, and other important documents, have been furnished to Mr. Parkman by the Abbé Faillon, the author of *La Colonie Française en Canada.* Mr. Parkman may thus be taken as a safe arbiter when, as is frequently his needful office in the course of his narrative, he has to decide disputed points which touch the good repute of officials or prominent actors in the history he recounts, or to clear up doubtful points concerning localities or the course taken by different adventurers. There is no partisanship in his spirit or arguments. Of course the members of the Society of Jesus will have grievances against him, for he has given some very candid expressions of his own views as to the mundane and thrifty motives which came, after a time, to qualify their early singleness of zeal as missionaries of the cross to barbarians. But if any champion of the society shall undertake criticism or rejoinder, he will have to deal with the facts and witnesses which stand behind Mr. Parkman. Nor will any new documents or arguments which may be brought forward to traverse his decisions receive a fairer appreciation or use from any one than from himself.

"The Discovery of the West" is, rightfully, the comprehensive title of the volume now in our hands. Of this the tracing of the tributaries of the Mississippi, and the following of its course into the Gulf, and the ascent of it in a canoe, are the crowning achievements. But the mouth of the river had a century before been seen by the Spaniards, as had also a few leagues of its lower waters. This prior discovery of the outlet of the great stream into a basin which received so many muddy supplies had itself wellnigh passed into oblivion, and had never been turned to any uses save simply to sustain a traditionary Spanish prerogative, and to furnish a basis for hostility against adventurers of any other nationality who might presume at any time to attempt a temporary or permanent occupation of the im-

mense area which the river drained. Jean Nicollet was the first Frenchman who penetrated to one of the northern tributaries of the Mississippi. He had been some twenty years in Canada, and had become famous as an interpreter. An Indian in his habits, he still remained a zealous Catholic, and, we are told, returned to civilized life in order to enjoy its comforts. He had spent eight or nine years with the Nepissings, on the lake of that name. Here he had heard a story of a strange people without beard or hair, who came from the farther West to trade with a tribe beyond the Great Lakes. If he had had his life prolonged to our day, and on one of his Western tramps had come upon a working party of Coolies on the Pacific Railroad, his vision would have been substantially realized. But while he anticipated a fact which time was to accomplish, he was slightly confused as to localities, routes, and modes of conveyance. He inferred that these shorn and beardless traders from our own far West, who proved to be simply Winnebagoes, were Chinese or Japanese. Before the mystery had been cleared up, Nicollet welcomed an opportunity of being sent on an embassy to the supposed Orientals; and that he might meet them as became the importance of the occasion, he had a dress of ceremony prepared for himself, — "a robe of Chinese damask embroidered with birds and flowers." Thus apparelled he approached the strangers, holding a pistol in either hand. "The squaws and children fled, screaming that it was a manitou, or spirit, armed with thunder and lightning; but the chiefs and warriors regaled him with so bountiful a hospitality that a hundred and twenty beavers were devoured at a single feast."

La Salle was likewise persuaded that the nations of the East were accessible from Canada by a canoe-voyage, with occasional portages. Of this fancy there is a fitting memorial in the name La Chine, still borne by the tract of land and the rapids above it nine miles from Montreal, on the St. Lawrence, which constituted the original *seigneurie* given to La Salle by the priests of St. Sulpice, its feudal proprietors. Before his enterprise was undertaken there had been a fancy that the Orient might be approached through the northwestern lakes and streams entered by the Ottawa, and an expedition

under Champlain had tested the theory. Just before the coming of La Salle, the trading Indians who visited Quebec and Montreal gave more emphatic though still mysterious reports of a great river in the West which flowed to the salt sea; and these reports, in still more definite shape, excited the missionaries who had pierced to the farthest outposts on the lakes. La Salle imagined that the river emptied into the Vermilion Sea or Gulf of California, though he was not so mastered by this fancy as not to admit the alternative outlet which he afterwards verified.

Robert Cavalier de La Salle, born at Rouen in 1643, came of a good burgher though not a noble stock. He had, however, the nobility of nature. Self-reliant, independent, and reserved, generally the master of his passions and impulses, dauntless and generous, and with dignity and perseverance to sustain him under reverses, and to enable him to triumph over the opposition of man and nature, he was especially fitted for his enterprise. He was a devout Catholic, though independent of arbitrary control in religion. In his early years he had been under the influence of the Jesuits, and, it would seem, had been employed by them as a school-teacher. But he freed himself from the control of a system which required only obedience, and left no place for one like himself, capable of originating and conducting an enterprise of transcendent importance. He had an elder brother in Canada, a Sulpitian abbé. Arriving at Montreal in 1666, with the ardent enthusiasm of youth, and with so slender a patrimony as to throw him upon his own resources, he accepted the seigniory given him by the priests of the seminary, evidently only because its possession might yield him aid in prosecuting the great enterprise of his life. The most definite information he could obtain represented the Ohio and the Mississippi as one stream, the passage of which to the sea would require eight or nine months. Rough clearings, bordered by the primeval forests, the lurking-places of a treacherous and savage foe, and but half subdued and fitted for the uses of civilized life, represented the stage of French colonization at that time. Still a vigorous and profitable trade in furs had already furnished occasion for rival interests and for sharp feuds among the colonists. La

Salle found party spirit and strife running high. If to the early Jesuit missionaries, who with all-enduring patience and heroism attested their zeal under awful sufferings and tortures, we allow a higher place on the roll of willing martyrs in the work of converting barbarians than we assign to those whose faith was best represented by the labors of Eliot and the Mayhews, we are at liberty to suggest that a heart divided between the interests of worldly profit and religion is chargeable alike against Jesuits and Puritans on this continent. La Salle, from the beginning to the end of his career, found himself involved in enmities and embarrassments originating in rivalries and monopolies created by trade. Mr. Parkman feels justified in affirming, with full evidence adduced, that the period with which he is dealing was a critical one in this respect. The early Jesuit zeal, in its single-heartedness and intensity for the conversion of the savages, had declined, or rather had become mingled with secular aims, which were changing the enterprise of France in Canada from that of a mission to that of a thriving colony. The Jesuits would appear to have transferred the place of realizing their dream of a new Paraguay from the borders of the Great Lakes to the valley of the West; but in the transfer the element of thrift had displaced the unworldliness of devotion.

La Salle at once gave himself with such diligence to the acquisition of the Indian tongues, that he is reported within less than three years to have mastered the Iroquois and seven or eight other languages or dialects. He spent two or three years in improving his seigniory, and then sold it back again, mostly to the seminary, to secure the means for carrying out the project of exploration for which at Quebec he had won the countenance, though not the pecuniary aid, of Courcelles, the Governor, and Talon, the Intendant, of Canada. He hired fourteen men and bought four canoes, with supplies. At the same time the Sulpitians at Montreal, jealous alike of the civil and ecclesiastical ascendency of the Jesuits, had devised a reinforcement of their mission farther west, in which the Abbé Fénélon, elder brother of the famous archbishop, was a laborer. Courcelles advised that La Salle should combine his with the seminary's expedition, under the priests Dollier and Galinée, who had three canoes

and seven hired men. The priests were fit men, but La Salle, as it proved, could not share authority.

On the 6th of July, 1669, the joint party, comprising twenty-four men in seven canoes, starting from La Chine, — hopefully significant in its name of the land which the leader intended to reach, — embarked on the Lake of St. Louis, stemmed the dangerous rapids of the St. Lawrence, and threaded their way through the Thousand Isles. With the party were two canoes of Senecas who had wintered with La Salle, and who were to be his guides. What followed is to us romance. The whole expedition is rich in subjects for the painter and the poet. Its experiences, while not without their fascinations for the hardy and disciplined among the adventurers, had many stern features and were full of appalling risks. To intrust all their supplies of food, ammunition, medicine, clothing, and presents for Indians to birchen canoes; to guide these frail barks through sedgy streams and rapids and by treacherous lake shores; to unlade and relade them at the frequent portages, hiding a portion of their burden as the craft themselves and their cargoes were transported on the shoulders in successive tramps through the tangled and oozy forests; — these were prudential and physical tasks to which men of nerve and muscle might readily adapt themselves. But to extemporize their pilotage, to venture into the solitudes and mysteries of the wilderness, to learn how to economize labor by an acute study of natural phenomena, and to supply their wants by hunting, while on the watch night and day against a wily foe who had not learned the amenities of civilized warfare, — these exigencies demanded qualities which are recognized as latent in human beings only when extraordinary emergencies call them forth. Yet it is surprising with what facility of adaptation and resource men born to quite other surroundings and circumstances in the Old World, not only conformed themselves to the excitement and anxieties of their wild life, but grew, as with the cravings of a second nature, to require them. The strange charms of adventure neutralized all the abounding perils and the dismal frugality to which they exposed themselves. Men who could subsist for months on strips of raw hide and shreds of old moccasins, with a dessert of bark and buds and lichens, and who

could swallow the greasy and loathsome offerings which Indian hospitality put into their mouths by the fingers of a grimy squaw, had had a marvellous training in endurance.

When La Salle's party, after thirty days of toil and exposure, reached Lake Ontario, every white man among them was suffering from some form of disease. When they had proceeded on their way as far as the Seneca village on the banks of the Genesee, expecting there to find guides for their farther course, La Salle found himself thwarted by the Jesuit Fremin, stationed at that village. But after a month's delay the route was resumed, under the guidance of an Indian from the head of the lake. Meeting here the famous Louis Joliet, returning from an unsuccessful attempt to explore the copper-mines of Lake Superior, a change of plans divided the party. Joliet persuaded the Sulpitian priests to undertake a mission to tribes on the Upper Lakes; and La Salle, glad to be left without hindrance in his own schemes, took advantage of his prostration by a fever to intimate a purpose of retracing his way, and allowed them to depart, after observing with them the rites of the Church. The priests' party, after a calamitous winter at the eastern extremity of Lake Erie, passed in the spring to its westerly shore, and made the first recorded passage of white men through the Straits of Detroit. Their object was by this route to join the trading tribes in their annual descent of the Ottawa to Montreal, and they accomplished it. Their missionary work was abandoned because of the loss of their baggage, including their altar-service, and because of the cold reception which they met from the Jesuits Dablon and Marquette, at Ste. Marie du Saut.

In the mean while La Salle, whose feigned purpose of returning to Montreal was simply a veil to cover his independent course, at once busied himself in active exploration, and certainly made important discoveries; though the exact direction and extent of these for the two following years are invested with mystery. La Salle kept journals and made maps which were known to be in the possession of his niece as late as 1656, but have not since been traced. From an unpublished paper, the contents of which purport to have been dictated by La Salle in Paris, as to the state of things in Canada previous to 1678, claims are advanced for him during each of these

two years, one of which Mr. Parkman credits, the other he thinks not sustained. The former is that he reached the Ohio, and followed it down to the falls at Louisville. Of this enterprise Mr. Parkman thinks there can be no reasonable doubt. But he discredits the assertion that in the latter of these two years La Salle penetrated to the Illinois and traced it to its mouth in the Mississippi, and then pursued the great river far enough to assure himself of its discharge into the Gulf of Mexico. If La Salle had thus gained priority over Joliet and Marquette, the rightful claimants to the discovery of the Mississippi, it is strange that neither he nor the officials of Canada should have announced the fact, as they did not. Our author thinks it possible that he reached the Illinois.

Leaving his main hero for an interval, Mr. Parkman devotes three chapters to the Jesuit Missions and trading schemes on the Lakes, the measures adopted for gaining possession of the West, and the enterprise and fortunes of Joliet and Marquette. The appalling fate visited upon the missions of the Jesuits among the Hurons, described in all its harrowing particulars in the author's preceding volume, "The Jesuits in North America," had turned the zeal of the Order in a new direction, and had impaired its simplicity. The Iroquois, the ruthless destroyers of the Hurons, were already too much under Dutch and English influence to offer a full field for that zeal, with the new element which mingled in it, though bold and active servants of the Order were at work among them. But their energy was now mainly turned to the tribes and territories and the fur-trade of the North and West, which they meant to bring under the sway of France. Objects of secular enterprise and thrift are now recognized in the *Relations* of the Order. Their two principal missions were at the extremities of Lake Superior.

Father Claude Allouez founded a mission at Green Bay. Our author's sketch of this mission is full of spirit and interest, with a touch of drollery. We believe that Allouez's name is not borne by any town or city of the West, though it has been assumed by a mining company. Is this significant of any traditionary estimate of the good father? There certainly is significance in the fact that while the first lay assistants of

the Jesuits, working for devotion, bore the epithet of *donnés*, or given men, their places were now mainly supplied by *engagés*, working for wages.

Talon, the Intendant of Canada, a bold and far-seeing man, had proposed to Louis XIV., through Colbert, a scheme — involving a purchase-payment to England, and the same to the Dutch or a war — which, had it been tried, might have given to France permanent empire in the New World. Failing in this proposition, he determined upon other measures. He sent an expedition in 1670, to be sustained by its profits in trade, under St. Lusson and the interpreter Perrot, one of the most remarkable of *voyageurs*, to search for copper-mines on Lake Superior, and to take formal possession of the whole country for the king. The object was accomplished so far as to secure at Saut Ste. Marie, on June 14, 1671, the setting up of the arms of France, with a proclamation, and a display of Indian and French rhetoric. The Governor and Intendant of Canada, both able men, but of irreconcilable relations and purposes, were recalled to France. The new Governor, Frontenac, accepted the advice of Talon, before he left, to appoint Louis Joliet agent of an expedition for tracing the Mississippi. This man, humbly born in Quebec in 1645, had received the minor orders of the Jesuits, but, though retaining friendly relations with the fathers, he had renounced his vocation, and become a fur-trader. Father Marquette, whom he was to meet at St. Ignace, Michilimackinac, was to accompany him. Marquette, one of the most noble and engaging of the class of men whose toils and buffetings are the staple of this volume, came of an honored French stock, and was now thirty-five years of age. He had mastered six of the Indian languages, and was one of the most devoted and single-hearted of the Jesuits in the type of piety that characterized them. The following extract brings him vividly before us : —

" The traits of his character are unmistakable. He was of the brotherhood of the early Canadian missionaries, and the true counterpart of Garnier or Jogues. He was a devout votary of the Virgin Mary ; who, imaged to his mind in shapes of the most transcendent loveliness with which the pencil of human genius has ever informed the canvas, was to him the object of an adoration not unmingled with a sentiment of

chivalrous devotion. The longings of a sensitive heart, divorced from earth, sought solace in the skies. A subtile element of romance was blended with the fervor of his worship, and hung like an illumined cloud over the harsh and hard realities of his daily lot. Kindled by the smile of his celestial mistress, his gentle and noble nature knew no fear. For her he burned to dare and to suffer, discover new lands and conquer new realms to her sway." — p. 50.

And here is a graphic sketch, which follows the travellers after they had reached the mission at the head of Green Bay: —

"The travellers had no sooner reached the town than they called the chiefs and elders to a council. Joliet told them that the Governor of Canada had sent him to discover new countries, and that God had sent his companion to teach the true faith to the inhabitants; and he prayed for guides to show them the way to the waters of the Wisconsin. The council readily consented; and on the 10th of June the Frenchmen embarked again, with two Indians to conduct them. All the town came down to the shore to see their departure. Here were the Miamis, with long locks of hair dangling over each ear, after a fashion which Marquette thought very becoming; and here, too, the Mascoutins and the Kickapoos, whom he describes as mere boors in comparison with their Miami townsmen. All stared alike at the seven adventurers, marvelling that men could be found to risk an enterprise so hazardous.

"The river twisted among lakes and marshes choked with wild rice; and, but for their guides, they could scarcely have followed the perplexed and narrow channel. It brought them at last to the portage; where, after carrying their canoes a mile and a half over the prairie and through the marsh, they launched them on the Wisconsin, bade farewell to the waters that flowed to the St. Lawrence, and committed themselves to the current that was to bear them they knew not whither, — perhaps to the Gulf of Mexico, perhaps to the South Sea or the Gulf of California. They glided calmly down the tranquil stream, by islands choked with trees and matted with entangling grape-vines; by forests, groves, and prairies, — the parks and pleasure-grounds of a prodigal nature; by thickets and marshes and broad bare sand-bars; under the shadowing trees, between whose tops looked down from afar the bold brow of some woody bluff. At night, the bivouac, — the canoes inverted on the bank, the flickering fire, the meal of bison-flesh or venison, the evening pipes, and slumber beneath the stars; and when in the morning they embarked again, the mist hung on the river like a

bridal-veil; then melted before the sun, till the glassy water and the languid woods basked breathless in the sultry glare." — pp. 53 – 55.

They practised great caution in their advance; making a fire on the shore to cook their rude supper, extinguishing it, paddling their canoes farther on, and anchoring in the stream, with a man on watch till morning. For more than a fortnight they met no trace of a human being. At last, following some footprints in the mud, the two fathers boldly walked on till they came to a village of the Illinois, where they were received in a friendly manner. The travellers, making the rest of their way with much exciting adventure and Indian hospitality, passed the mouth of the Illinois, and the muddy influx of the Missouri, the site of St. Louis, and the junction of the Ohio, the Beautiful River, and, having reached an Indian village below the mouth of the Arkansas, they took counsel. They had assured themselves that the Mississippi emptied into the Gulf of Mexico, which was still seven hundred miles below them, though they thought it much nearer. Fearing that the results of their discovery might be lost if they should be killed by the Indians or Spaniards, they concluded to return to Canada. On July 17 they began to paddle in the midsummer heat against the swift current, exposed to deadly exhalations. No wonder Marquette was seized with dysentery, and threw an intenser fervor into his invocations to his celestial mistress. The party reached Green Bay after an absence of four months, having paddled their canoes more than twenty-five hundred miles. Marquette, whose disease at times seemed to be checked, was compelled to stop during the winter and the next summer to recruit at Green Bay. A temporary revival of his vigor enabled him to renew his missionary work; but his fate is thus touchingly told: —

"A few days after Easter he left the village, escorted by a crowd of Indians, who followed him as far as Lake Michigan. Here he embarked with his two companions. Their destination was Michilimackinac, and their course lay along the eastern borders of the lake. As, in the freshness of advancing spring, Pierre and Jacques urged their canoe along that lonely and savage shore, the priest lay, with dimmed sight and prostrated strength, communing with the Virgin and the angels. On the 19th of May he felt that his hour was near; and, as they

passed the mouth of a small river, he requested his companions to land. They complied, built a shed of bark on a rising ground near the bank, and carried thither the dying Jesuit. With perfect cheerfulness and composure he gave directions for his burial, asked their forgiveness for the trouble he had caused them, administered to them the sacrament of penitence, and thanked God that he was permitted to die in the wilderness, a missionary of the faith and a member of the Jesuit brotherhood. At night seeing that they were fatigued, he told them to take rest, saying that he would call them when he felt his time approaching. Two or three hours after they heard a feeble voice, and, hastening to his side, found him at the point of death. He expired calmly, murmuring the names of Jesus and Mary, with his eyes fixed on the crucifix which one of his followers held before him. They dug a grave beside the hut, and here they buried him according to the directions which he had given them; then re-embarking, they made their way to Michilimackinac, to bear the tidings to the priests at the mission of St. Ignace." — pp. 70, 71.

The year was 1675. Joliet, on his way to Quebec, after leaving Marquette, met with one of those provoking mishaps which bring ruin after manifold perils and crises have been safely passed. His canoe was overset in the rapids of La Chine, two of his men and an Indian boy were drowned, all his papers were lost, and he himself barely escaped.

Mr. Parkman now recalls our thought from Marquette, "with clasped hands and upturned eyes, a figure evoked from some dim legend of mediæval saintship," to La Salle, "with feet firm planted on the hard earth, breathing the self-relying energies of modern practical enterprise." His vision embraced three great aims, — to open a passage through the West to India and China, to anticipate the English and Spanish in the monopoly of a mighty commerce, and to control the Mississippi by a fort at its mouth. He needed powerful patronage and money. The conditions on which he obtained these involved him in rival interests and many embarrassments. The Governor, Frontenac, was for personal ends in harmony with his projects, and his rich relatives, proud of their kinsman, furnished him money. Canada now lived on the fur-trade. Hence were developed a body of men, *coureurs de bois*, roaming with the Indians, and often as barbarous as they. The king interdicted this straggling from civilization, with its ir-

regularities, and enjoined the colonists to live and trade only in the settlements. His officials sought to impose these restrictions on others and on one another, while each evaded the spirit of it for himself. Perrot, Governor of Montreal, sent men into the woods for trade, which crossed the schemes of Frontenac, the Governor-General, who did the same. Perrot's goods came by the Ottawa. Frontenac, therefore, established a trading-post, under the name of a fort bearing his own name, on Lake Ontario. La Salle availed himself of this as his rendezvous. In the autumn of 1674 he went to France. With the help of his relatives and petitions to the king, he received the rank of an untitled noble, and the seignory of Fort Frontenac, built then of wood, at the king's charges. He was pledged there to form a French colony and to domesticate the Indians, through one or more Récollet friars, favored by Frontenac and La Salle as a part of their hostility to the Jesuits. Frontenac cared little for priests of any class, but La Salle, with strong religious feeling, had sincere reverence for the Church. Mr. Parkman draws shrewdly many suggestive hints from an anonymous memoir professedly written by one who had made the acquaintance of La Salle in Paris, in 1678, in which secret enmities and wiles are traced out, and an account is given of an attempt on the life of La Salle by poison, — an attempt which seems to have been made a second time. To make sure of his hold upon his seignory on Lake Ontario, he within two years rebuilt Fort Frontenac in solid stone, disposed the neighborhood according to his own ulterior views, and constructed four small decked vessels for trade and transit, still keeping himself well supplied with canoes. Again at the Court of France, in 1677, highly commended to the king, and in favor with the great Minister, Colbert, he received additional powers, and large advances of money from his rich relatives. The Western trade was freely opened to him, but he was interdicted the Ottawa trade at Montreal. He reached Canada again in July, 1678, with full supplies and thirty followers, among whom was his stanch lieutenant, Tonty, a man of nobleness and prowess, trusty and effective, though he had lost a hand.

Father Hennepin, whom La Salle met at Quebec, was over-

joyed when the privilege was granted him of joining the great expedition. This worthy Franciscan, though his imagination and vanity led him to trifle with the truth, had many excellent qualities. He was bold and adventurous, claiming equally a zeal for souls and a passion for wilderness travel. He was the historian of the expedition. Mr. Parkman assures us that "he often told the truth."

With the Sieur de la Motte, another of La Salle's more trusted but hardly trustworthy followers, Hennepin was sent ahead from Fort Frontenac, with sixteen men, in a little vessel of ten tons. Hennepin, with some of the party, ascended in a canoe as far as Queenstown Heights, and, roaming on to the banks of Chippewa Creek, they beheld, in as yet unprofaned solitudes, the great cataract. Their purpose was to build a fort at the mouth of the Niagara, and it was begun, though hot water was necessary to soften the frozen ground. In the mean while a visit was made, for prudential purposes, to the great village of the Senecas, and here again Jesuit influence was encountered. La Salle soon after followed. "This resolute child of misfortune had already begun to taste the bitterness of his destiny." He had left, in charge of a careless pilot, the vessel in which, with Tonty, he was bringing supplies to the advanced party. It was wrecked nine or ten leagues west of Niagara. Though the provisions and merchandise were lost, the crew saved the anchors and cables destined for another vessel which La Salle proposed to build above the falls. The misfortune disheartened the party, and caused dissensions. La Motte returned to Canada, and others who had been tampered with by La Salle's enemies faltered. La Salle himself now, as always, confronted cruel disappointment, and locked his griefs, as also his confidence, in his own breast.

The small craft was drawn ashore by a capstan, and the heavy lading, first lifted to the steep heights above Lewiston, was transported by some thirty men twelve miles, across snowy plains and through dense forests. Mr. Parkman, after a thorough personal examination of a controverted point, decides that Cayuga Creek is the spot where was built the first vessel for the navigation of the Upper Lakes. It was hard winter work, this building of a vessel of forty-five tons on the edge of the

wilderness, with Indians threatening to burn it. During its progress La Salle walked back to his fort to get supplies, and to pacify his creditors. Two men attended him, and a dog dragged his baggage through the snow-bound forest, for two hundred and fifty miles. A bag of parched corn was their food, which wholly failed them two days before they reached the fort, on Lake Ontario. In La Salle's absence Tonty finished the vessel, which was launched in the spring of 1679, with the singing of the *Te Deum*, the discharge of cannon, and the shouts and yells of French and Indians, stimulated by brandy. The amazed natives looked on as she was towed out at a safe distance from their firebrands and tomahawks. "Five small cannon looked out from her portholes, and on her prow was carved a portentous monster, the Griffin, whose name she bore in honor of the armorial bearings of Frontenac. La Salle had often been heard to say that he would make the griffin fly above the crows; in other words, make Frontenac triumph over the Jesuits." It was not till August that La Salle, bringing with him three more friars, came up to see the moored vessel. He had encountered more disasters from enemies and creditors, but his stoicism supported him.

Thirty-four voyagers embarked, and on August 7th the Griffin ploughed the waves of Lake Erie with the first sails ever spread on its waters. Well supplied with game, and enjoying the scenery, Hennepin, while passing through the Straits of Detroit, writes: "Those who will one day have the happiness to possess this pleasant and fertile strait will be very much obliged to those who have shown them the way." A furious storm on Lake Huron wellnigh wrecked ship and hope, but St. Anthony of Padua, under the promise of a chapel, came to the rescue, and at last, peacefully reposing behind the point of St. Ignace, the Griffin fired a salute in the ears of yelping Indians and scowling Jesuits. The adventurers heard mass in the bark chapel of an Ottawa village. "La Salle knelt before the altar, in a mantle of scarlet, bordered with gold. Soldiers, sailors, and artisans knelt around him, black Jesuits, gray Récollets, swarthy *voyageurs*, and painted savages; a devout but motley concourse."

In the previous autumn La Salle had sent a party in advance,

for trade and preparation, to the Illinois. These had been tampered with, and failed him. He soon sailed on to Green Bay, where, breaking his covenant, he laded his vessel with furs from the forbidden region, and sent the Griffin back to Niagara to satisfy his creditors. She was never to reach her destination, and a mystery hangs over her fate. She had on board the rigging and anchors for another vessel, which La Salle had intended to build on the Mississippi, and she was to have returned through the Lakes with supplies, after the voyage on which he had dismissed her.

La Salle resumed his western course early in September, with fourteen men, in four canoes deeply laden with a forge, tools, merchandise, and arms. Amid many perils from wind, water, and Indians, they circled the southern shore of Lake Michigan, Father Hennepin, with his brother friars, Zenobe Membré, and Gabriel Ribourde, narrowly escaping drowning, under somewhat ludicrous circumstances. Finally reaching the mouth of the St. Joseph, La Salle, after a tedious delay and a threatened mutiny, was rejoined by Tonty, and then on the 3d of December, 1679, with forebodings of the fate of the Griffin in the storm which he had himself encountered, he committed himself with his whole party, thirty-three in number, in eight canoes, to the dreary current of the St. Joseph. A portage of five miles brought them to the upper waters of the Kankakee and the Illinois. They kept a wary watch for Indians, and La Salle, who had a wonderful power over the natives, acted discreetly in conciliating such parties of them as he encountered. His own men caused him even greater anxiety, for the lawless spirit of the wilderness came over them. The qualities which fitted them for their enterprise made them also reckless and insubordinate. Many of them, being outlaws and desperadoes, were tempted to resist discipline, to drop off from their fellows, to shirk the dismal labor of their trampings, and to seek a fuller license by scattering themselves among the Indians, who readily gave them harborage. Doubtless in some cases this mischief was compensated by providing among these *coureurs de bois*, savage whites and half-breeds, a certain sort of pioneers of civilization, and interpreters of unwritten tongues.

La Salle, still waiting for supplies by the Griffin, determined to fortify himself for the winter on the Illinois. The site of this rude stronghold, which was called Fort Crèvecœur, may still be seen, a little below Peoria. It was reared in a spirit of sustained hopefulness, but disaster and sorrow — the shadows that constantly overhung the plans and the fate of its founder — were to be its record in the chronicle. The intrepid commander resolved to retrace his way through the winter wilderness to his lake fort, in order to provide the longed-for equipments of his river vessel, with which he hoped to find his way to the West Indies. Before he set out he saw the hull of the ship nearly completed on the stocks, and leaving her and her builders under the charge of the faithful Tonty, and sending Hennepin with two companions to explore the Illinois to its mouth, he himself, with four Frenchmen and an Indian, started on the 2d of March, 1680, for Fort Frontenac. On his arduous way, amid all conceivable hardships and risks, his attention was attracted to the remarkable river cliff, called the Starved Rock, and he sent back word to Tonty to make it his stronghold in any emergency. After travelling sixty-five days, over a course of a thousand miles, "the most arduous journey ever made by Frenchmen in America," La Salle, alone of his party, reached his destination on the 6th of May. It was only to learn of new losses for his shattered fortunes, and soon after to receive tidings of destruction, mutiny, and desertion at Fort Crèvecœur, that this fated man arrived again in Canada. Again he made his way, by the northern route, to the Illinois country for the rescue of Tonty, and there he was a witness of the awful desolation of Indian warfare. Mr. Parkman furnishes us an appalling description of its horrors, and is at pains to reproduce for us the great Indian Illinois town. An episode gives us the adventures of the lugubrious and boastful Hennepin, the false and the true, on the Upper Mississippi and among the Sioux. We have an admirable description of the first view by white men of a stampede of buffaloes, with much other information respecting the scenery and influence of the freshly opened depths of the wilderness.

La Salle had to begin anew. With the courage of which only natures like his are capable, he kept despondency at bay,

and faced the lowering future under the burden of crushing debts and baffled endeavors. He formed a scheme for colonizing the tribes of the Illinois in a defensive league, with himself at the head, to keep the Iroquois at bay, and to secure trade. His first ready allies were refugees at Fort Miami from the New England and Virginia Indian wars.

After making some progress in this scheme, helped by his own indomitable energy and fertility of resource, he again made his toilsome return to Fort Frontenac, once more with partial success to recover from misfortune, bankruptcy, and treachery. In the November of 1681 we find him with his canoes and other followers again leaving the Lake waters of the West for the tributary streams of the Great River, and exerting his skill for the Indian league. This time he succeeds, and makes his way, amid perils which required all his address, to the salt water, and there, at the mouth of the Mississippi, he erects the arms of France, and by solemn proclamation, accompanied by the *Te Deum*, and other religious rites, he takes formal possession of the country in the name of Louis XIV. This was to be the fulness of his triumph. So far his success was to reach, the reward of high, persistent manliness, fortitude, and consecrated resolve; he thought this success, however, was but a stage in the fulfilment of further great purposes. In these, without fault or folly of his own, he was to be miserably thwarted. Ascending the Mississippi he was prostrated by dangerous disease. He planted his fort, St. Louis of the Illinois, on the Starved Rock; and as he had been foiled in his purpose of having a ship built on the river, he had still once more to traverse the now familiar route to Canada, and then to sail for France.

We find this man of the wilderness — for sixteen years wonted to "crag, forest, and prairie, squalid wigwams and naked savages" — standing amid the glittering masquerade of the French court, and announcing "what he had achieved in words of energetic simplicity, more impressive than all the tinsel of rhetoric." Count Frontenac, who in his turn had been recalled, was his friend, and he had others. He needed all of them, for he had enemies too, and the complications and rivalries of the trading interest in furs, stronger than relig-

ious zeal, threatened to result in a sacrifice even of the ends of empire. It was La Salle's aim in his memorial to secure abundant royal patronage, to sail with a fleet to the Gulf of Mexico, to fortify the mouth of the Mississippi, and to hold the river and its trade for France. To give the interest of excitement and profit to his great enterprise, he set it forth as the means for driving out the Spaniards and mastering the wealth of Mexico. Four vessels were furnished him, with stores, ordnance, and ammunition, and a company, including soldiers, sailors, priests, and colonists, of about two hundred and eighty. The hope of the deserving leader mounted high, but it was an ill-starred enterprise, discordant in its elements, with rankling jealousies entering into its preliminary stages and organization, having two authoritative managers, and wofully guided into disasters and absolute ruin. The narrative is one of those so sadly abounding in the wearisome annals of human history, in which catastrophes, wrecks, baffled plans, and broken hearts express to us the conditions through which the world gathers all its greater gains.

Beaujeu, a captain of the royal navy, to whom was committed the naval command of the expedition, proved unaccommodating and finally doggedly and bitterly hostile to La Salle, parting from him at last in the extremity of his need and failure in the Gulf by a deed whose meanness exceeded its treachery. On the way, after delays, a smothered quarrel, and a putting back for repairs, they stopped at a West India port, to learn the loss of one of their four vessels. Here, too, La Salle, attacked with a violent and nearly fatal fever, was tormented and driven into a relapse by dissensions, which hardly stopped short of absolute mutiny. They had left France on the 1st of August, 1684, provisioned, as Beaujeu affirmed, for only six months. It was near the end of November before La Salle could resume the voyage. But a formal courtesy, and that shown mainly on his part, thinly veiled the feud that rankled between him and his fellow-commander. With little regard for the Spanish decree which shut the Gulf of Mexico against all foreigners, and under real peril because not a single man in the expedition knew anything of the navigation of its waters, they held a northerly course on entering it, and on December

28th saw land from the mast-head. Misled by an exaggerated allowance for the force of the easterly currents, they went too far westward. La Salle had taken the latitude of the mouth of the Mississippi, but could not determine its longitude. He believed that he had passed its mouth on the 6th of January, and urged Beaujeu to go back. But that truculent commander, insisting upon the insufficiency of his provisions for his return voyage, refused to linger any longer. La Salle, mistaking Matagorda Bay in Texas for one of the western mouths of the Mississippi, made a landing there, and thus fixed the fate of his enterprise. His name is borne by the place where he disembarked. Beaujeu returned to France with one of three remaining vessels; the other two were wrecked on the sand-bars. There is evidence that Beaujeu sought, in his homeward course, for the mouth of the Mississippi, that he found it and made a map of it, leaving his ill-omened associate to his mistake, with all its harrowing consequences. It remained only for La Salle to duplicate his Illinois Fort by Fort St. Louis of Texas, gather from his stranded vessels what could be saved of their precious cargoes, and then, by weary and fruitless and perilous journeys of exploration, discover his fatal error. Even then he did not quail nor sink. His elasticity and energy, his self-reliance, and the magnetism of his influence, still sustained him and kept a remnant of his followers faithful to him. But it is a woful story from this point to the end. We prefer that our readers should follow it for themselves in Mr. Parkman's sympathetic and all too faithful and melancholy minuteness of detail. They will hardly peruse with unmoistened eye the narrative of La Salle's assassination and the tragic rehearsal of the fortunes of his followers.

As we have sketched a portion of the contents of this volume, our comments have been frequent and distinct enough to indicate our high estimate of the importance of Mr. Parkman's theme, and of the ability with which he has treated it. Roaming with his inquisitive eye and with his thoroughly furnished mind amid the scenes through which he traces the course of pioneer adventures, he has so sympathetically entered into their schemes and experiences, that he has been able to look

aside from the modern aspects of those scenes, and to behold them as they presented themselves to the men whose story he tells. La Salle, we fully believe, would give his approval to the rehearsal and interpretation of his own plans; and would be satisfied with the estimate of his own character, a noble and profoundly appreciative portraiture, — not an eulogium or a panegyric, — which our author has presented in these pages. Our national literature has, as yet, received few abler or more attractive contributions than are contained in Mr. Parkman's volumes.

GEORGE ELLIS.

ART. III. — 1. CARL VOGT, *Vorlesungen über den Menschen, etc.* Giessen. 1863. DR. ERNST HAECKEL, *Natürliche Schöpfungsgeschichte.* Berlin. 1868.

2. DR. L. BÜCHNER, *Sechs Vorlesungen über die Darwin'sche Theorie.* Leipzig. 1868. FRITZ MÜLLER, *Für und Wider Darwin.* Leipzig. 1864.

IT is remarkable that the majority of the discoveries and contributions in the great scientific discussion of the day — that on the Development Theory and the Origin of the different forms of life — should have been made almost exclusively during the last fifteen years in England; France having contributed almost nothing to it, and Germany taking up now what England has long since begun. In the French scientific world, the overpowering influence of Cuvier and his "Cataclysm-theory," as well as of his famous discussion before the Paris Academy, in 1830, with Geoffroy de St. Hilaire, on the "Changeability of Species," has been to transfer the question of the formation of species to the region of transcendental speculation, and to leave France from that day to this entirely outside of "the great argument."

In Germany, it was reserved for a poet to give the first indication of the main scientific drift of this half-century. Goethe, who was philosopher as well as poet, in his treatises upon the Metamorphosis of Plants and the Laws of Organization, and his Introduction to Comparative Anatomy (1793), pointed distinctly

towards a theory of development as the most probable explanation of the formation of the various kingdoms of life. He saw clearly the two great laws at the basis of development, and the names which his poetic insight gave to them have clung to them ever since: the law of Inheritance, or "the centripetal force" of all organisms, and the law of Variation (or adaptation), or "the centrifugal force," which continually causes the organism to fly from its ancestral type.

"An inner original community," he says, "lies at the foundation of all organizations. The difference of forms, on the other hand, springs from the necessary relations to the outer world; and one should therefore assume with justice an original contemporaneous variation and an unceasingly progressive development, in order to be able to comprehend the equally constant as varying phenomena." * "For even by this, the harmony of the organic whole becomes possible, in that it is composed of identical parts, which modify themselves in very delicate variations. Related in their innermost, they appear to separate themselves in form, intention, and working to the furthest degree, yes, to set themselves opposite to one another; and so it becomes possible to nature to create and to melt into one another the most different and yet near-related systems, by modification of similar organs (p. 264).† "With the one animal, the bone can be simple and represent only the rudiment of an organ; with others, on the other hand, the same bone will be found in its full development and in its possible perfection" (p. 219). ‡

A pleasant instance of Goethe's interest in the development discussion is quoted by Haeckel from Soret's diary: —

"*Monday*, August 2, 1830. — The news of the opening of the July Revolution arrived to-day in Weimar and put everything in excitement. I went in the course of the afternoon to Goethe. 'Well,' cried he at once, 'what do you think of this great event? The volcano has broken out; everything is in flames, and there is no longer any action with

* Quoted by Haeckel, p. 74. See also the ingenious remarks of Goethe in regard to "Einen aufzustellenden Typus," etc., p. 247 (Stuttgart, 1842), as well his essay on *Osteologie* (1796).

† *Ueber die Gesetze der Organization*, etc. Stuttgart. 1833.

‡ *Einleitung in die vergleichende Anatomie.*

closed doors!' 'A fearful affair,' I replied; 'but what else could be expected under those circumstances and with such a ministry, than that they would end with the banishment of the royal family?' 'We appear not to understand one another, my best one!' answered Goethe. 'I do not speak at all of those people. The question with me is about far other matters. I speak of the contest in the academy, so immensely important for science, which has just come to open outbreak, between Cuvier and Geoffroy de St. Hilaire. We have now,' he continued, 'in Geoffroy de St. Hilaire a powerful ally for the future. . . . . But the best is that the synthetic mode of treating nature, introduced by Geoffroy into France, cannot now be made to step backwards.'"

Besides Goethe, Oken, undoubtedly, in the beginning of this century, in his *Urschleim*, or protoplasm theory, approached some of the latest hypotheses of the development school, as presented by Huxley, Max Schultze, and Haeckel. But this theory was put forward in such a fantastic form, and based on so little careful experiment, that it produced but slight effect on the scientific world.

It is an interesting fact that the great metaphysical thinker of Germany, Kant, should have felt the necessity or desirableness of a theory of genetic connection to explain the forms of organic life. "The agreement," he says, "of so many varieties of animals in a certain common *Scheme* which appears to lie at the foundation, not alone of their osseous structure, but also in the arrangement of the rest of their parts, ... allows an indeed weak ray of hope to fall into the spirit, that here at least something may be accomplished with the principle of the *Mechanism of Nature*, without which there can be, indeed, no natural science. This analogy of forms . . . . strengthens the supposition of an *essential relationship* of these in their production from a common original mother through the step-like approach of one variety of animals to another, down from that in which the principle of *Object* appears to be most secured, namely, Man, to the polyp, from this to mosses and lichens, and at last to the lowest observable step of nature, — raw matter." *

The necessity to the mind of this great thinker of some theory of development rather than of constant creation, in order to form any sound natural science, is striking, and in

* Quoted by Haeckel, p. 83.

harmony with the latest philosophical conclusions. In another passage, indeed, he doubts if any Newton will ever arise "who will explain even the production of a blade of grass after natural laws, arranged *without a purpose*." The world of thinkers and investigators may respond that a mechanical theory of organic development "without a purpose" is still as far away as ever, but not so a theory of production and variation which is apparently ruled throughout the organic and inorganic world by one grand all-directing purpose, that is, *progress*. Haeckel's enthusiastic announcement that Kant's doubt is met, and that a Newton has appeared in the science of biology, may indeed be felt as premature; still we may also agree that in the Darwinian theory of Natural Selection one of the great steps has been taken in the progress of human thought.

The words themselves, "Natural Selection," were a happy invention, and will probably always designate the great process by which Nature as a breeder is supposed to be selecting the varieties most suited to their circumstances.

The German term "Natural Breeding" is not so good, and Spencer's "survival of the fittest" does not keep enough in view the ever-working forces proceeding under an intelligent plan, which we call Nature. The idea, however, as often happens with great discoveries, had been promulgated before Darwin, and, singularly enough, the latter had his intention first called to this fact by an American correspondent.*

Dr. Wells, in his account of a "Female of the White Race, part of whose Skin is dark," published in 1818, gave a very distinct statement of the principle of Natural Selection, but he applied it alone to the adaptation of different races of men to their climates, and did not see its wider application.

The conception of the "struggle for existence," which plays so important a part in the Darwinian theory, and which the author states was first suggested to him by Malthus's celebrated work, had been already employed by De Candolle in regard to the relations of the vegetable growths of a country or

* The fact was furnished to Mr. Darwin by the present writer, who obtained it from a quiet but diligent student of science, Mr. Robert Rowley of Hastings-upon-Hudson.

locality. He did not, however, carry out the law to such an extent as Darwin, nor draw from it any general conclusions. The preparation throughout Europe for the Darwinian theory was undoubtedly made by the distinguished reformer in geology, Sir Charles Lyell, who refuted Cuvier's great thesis of cataclysms, or sudden catastrophes on the earth's surface in early geologic periods, and laid down the principle, one of the grandest generalizations of modern thought, that all ancient changes of the earth's surface, however immense or sudden in their appearance, were merely the results of the minute ordinary forces and agencies of to-day, working through enormous periods of time. This conception, once established, of course carries with it also the destruction of the theory of constant successive creations, after each supposed cataclysm; and the scientific mind is led, even in biology, on the true scientific path, of accounting for apparently mysterious and grand events by the slow operation of minute and ordinary causes, continued through immense reaches of time.

It is most honorable to this eminent student of nature, that though in the first editions of his Principles of Geology he contended in the most vigorous manner against the development theory of Lamarck (which was not based on strictly scientific principles), yet after the careful observations of Darwin and the statement of the law of Natural Selection, he candidly changed his position in the last edition, and in good measure accepted Darwin's theory.

Of Darwin himself, it has been well understood by his correspondents in various parts of the world, during the last thirty years, that he was unceasingly busy on some ingenious theory of development or explanation of varieties and species. During twenty-one years, — from 1837 to 1858, — while constantly occupied in his investigation, he published nothing, not desiring to put forward his hypothesis till sufficient facts were collected. How his volume on the Origin of Species was finally pushed into publicity, through the contemporaneous discovery of the principle of Natural Selection by another acute and original naturalist, Alfred Wallace, is too well known to need particular description here.

Whatever view may be entertained of the soundness of

Darwin's hypothesis as an hypothesis of Origin, or of his theory as a full and complete explanation of the formation of varieties and species, there can be no difference of opinion among scientific thinkers as to the incomparable carefulness and diligence with which he sifts and gathers together his facts, the candor with which he presents objections, and the cumulative and philosophical method of the construction of his famous argument. The great obstacle to the consideration even of his theory, by those not engaged in scientific studies, is what we may call *the refinement* of its reasoning. The hypothesis is somewhat parallel with Lyell's hypothesis of ordinary causes in ancient geological changes. The operation of minute and well-known causes on the small changes going on in the organic world which we see about us is carefully studied, and, under the condition of sufficient time, an hypothesis is framed, which shall explain the vaster and grander changes which have gone on before us. The laws of the "Struggle for Existence," of "Inheritance," "Variation," and "Natural Selection," or the survival of the forms of life most adapted to their circumstances, are claimed to cover all the facts and phenomena of organic life both past and present.

To the mind not trained in scientific reasoning, it seems a conclusion vastly out of proportion to the premises. But from the nature of the case, the premises cannot be complete. The evidence, before it is all put in, must be obtained from all the kingdoms of life in the present, and all past fossil periods. Whole libraries of these records have utterly perished, and vast collections of testimony are now entirely inaccessible. A point of evidence is accidentally hit upon here, a link discovered there, a missing strand in one place or a whole cable of testimony in another. Nowhere is the line of argument uninterrupted. But from a careful study of nature, certain laws have been deduced, such as those of Inheritance, Variation, and Natural Selection, which give a clew and guide at once in explaining a vast number of the present phenomena of organic nature. An hypothesis is framed from these which, it is believed, will cover other and past phenomena, and those on a grander scale. Even Darwin himself would not claim that, as yet, his theory fully explains these, but he might reasonably

ask, "What better hypothesis has been put forward?" for certainly the theory of constant supernatural acts requires even more evidence than his own, and is besides one which excludes scientific and philosophic investigation.

It need not be said to any student of natural science, that the Darwinian theory is one of the great intellectual events of the present century; influencing every department of investigation, and modifying all previous views as to the divisions and classification of the various kingdoms of life.

Nearly all the prominent scientific thinkers in England may be considered to have accepted it, either in part or in whole; and even Owen, though objecting to it nominally, offers a theory of development which seems to differ from it chiefly in name. On the Continent, however, its reception has not been so unanimous. In France, as we stated before, the influence of Cuvier has prevented its just consideration, though two celebrated botanists, Naudin and Lecoq, have avowed their belief in the changeability of species. In Switzerland, however, a distinguished geologist, Pictet, seems to incline towards it. In Germany, the influence of this new hypothesis, as might be expected, has been immense, but the treatment it has received, both from friends and foes, has not been so candid as was to be desired.

The German scientific mind is separated intellectually into two divisions: the specialists, who care little for any general philosophic conclusions; and the generalizers, who are mainly *a priori* thinkers, and eager to establish some theory of their own. The laborious and careful collation of facts, and then the patient and scientific effort to deduce the truth and only the truth from these various phenomena, seems to be a mental position not very familiar to the present scientific mind of Germany.

Unfortunately, too, the question of religion has entered at once into the consideration of this philosophic theory. The advent of Darwinism has been hailed by one party with enthusiastic joy as the dawn of atheism, and every glimmer of it has been denounced by another as the lurid light of infidelity and materialism. Unbelief and Religion have most absurdly divided themselves by the line of this theory.

A celebrated writer on biology and a scientific investigator,

Büchner, the title of one of whose works we have prefixed to this article, has treated the subject as if the great value of Darwin's hypothesis were in relieving mankind of the superstition of a Deity, and in laying a firm basis for materialism.

In his six lectures on Darwinism he has made not a single contribution to the science of the subject, but has unceasingly urged this theory as a full and sufficient substitute for the belief in an intelligent Creator, and indeed as a fatal argument against all processes of reasoning which conclude intelligent design from the mechanism of nature. It is remarkable that this author, as well as the prominent Darwinians of Germany, have treated their great leader's hypothesis with far more certainty and confidence than the author himself expresses. What he is carefully balancing and hesitating to accept, they put aside as already obtained; where he weighs opposing arguments with most scrupulous care, and at length ventures slightly to incline in one direction, they throw in their prejudices and declare the result as evident and not to be contradicted; inferences which Darwin only considers probable his German followers call axioms.

We find in their writings little of the philosophical caution or wide range of view of their leader. They do not seem able even to understand the hesitation of great knowledge and the deliberation of an unbiassed judgment. Thus, among many other instances, Darwin hesitates to accept the cross between the hare and the rabbit as a permanent variety or "species," though it would be a "capital fact" for his theory. The Germans unhesitatingly affirm it. From an immense observation of facts, Darwin refuses to assign external circumstances as the only or the greatest agency in determining variation, though it would be a most convenient conclusion for him. The Germans, like some of our own theorizers, conclude hastily that this is the *causa sufficiens*, and that all varieties are explained by it.

Darwin has feared to imbue his great subject with sentiment, and has wisely avoided touching on what is a necessary inference or link in his theory, — the genetic connection between man and the next lower order in physical structure of mammals and vertebrates. There is not an allusion in his work to the

physical differences or correspondences between human beings and the anthropoid apes. But the connections he does trace or indicate between different kingdoms of life will bridge much wider gaps than that between man and the simian tribes.

The Germans, with less delicacy and wisdom, but more logic, at once attack this difficult subject. Vogt, in his *Vorlesungen über den Menschen*, presents the most thorough comparison yet made between the brains and entire physical structure of man and the apes; attempting to demonstrate, what Huxley had already sought to prove, that the structural difference between the lowest tribe of man and the highest of the anthropoid apes is less than that between the highest and lowest of the apes. The argument of Vogt is carefully presented, but the spirit of it has something unscientific in tone, as if the author felt it one of the great triumphs of reason over superstition to prove man descended from the monkey. The correspondences he traces between the lowest negro tribes and the apes are curious, but such as might also be found between degenerated or inferior white or Aryan tribes and different simian varieties; while his effort to show that the *microcephali*, or idiots, are the last connecting link between humanity and the animals is not happy, even under the full Darwinian hypothesis. For it is not claimed by the great theorist that the law of Natural Selection could take an arrested or imperfect development and render it the most profitable in "the struggle for existence." Few analogies throughout the vegetable or animal kingdoms would favor an instance of a new and vigorous variety or species formed from the imperfect and arrested growth of an organism. And what possible combination of circumstances there could be in which a half-human idiot would have an advantage in the struggle for life over a fully developed ape is difficult to imagine. If it be merely meant by the author, that the *cretins* and *microcephalists* show certain marked resemblances to the simian races, this does not help his point, for these similarities cannot be accounted for on the theory of "profitable variations," and are therefore of no account in the development hypothesis.

Haeckel prefixes to his truly philosophical work — the

Schöpfungsgeschichte — a rather sensational picture of the heads and facial outlines of different human and simian races; but the monkeys are flattered and the men caricatured, and the writer, in his eagerness to support extreme views, has forgotten that, according to his leader's hypothesis, man could not be descended physically from the ape, but both must be derived from an intermediate form.

One of the illustrations in Haeckel's history is a much more convincing argument, being pictorial representations of the embryos of various classes of vertebrates at different stages of growth. As an argument for community of descent, hardly anything stronger can be found than embryonic resemblances.

This author, with the boldness of a German, does not hesitate to present his readers with a genealogical-tree of ancestors of the present family of man from the Alfurus and Papuas (whoever they may be), of the drift period, through the Cretins, Microcephali, Gorillas, Orangs, and Gibbons, of the pliocene and miocene periods to the Lemures (or half-apes) of the early eocene, and thus down, through vast ages of time, to the "lance-fishes" (*Amphioxi lanceolati*) of the silurian period, the base of the vertebrate family.

All these German authors whom we have quoted assume that the physical descent of man from the lower animals also includes the gradual formation of his faculties and mental and moral powers through natural selection from instincts; that these are the results of modifications of brain matter, and that thus "materialism" is scientifically founded. We may yet be compelled by science to admit that there is no essential difference in structure or brain between man and the highest order of apes, and less between them than between different species of apes; still, singularly enough, our materialistic writers do not see that this only renders the gap wider between man and the animals, spiritually, and takes away one link in the chain of materialistic argument. Here are two brains and structures — say those of the gorilla and the African Bushman — so alike that science can hardly draw a line of essential difference between them. Yet on one side we have a language showing a considerable degree of development, capable of

expressing many human feelings, affections, and hopes, of persuading with eloquence and rising into poetry and worship; simple as it is, yet complicated and wonderful in structure, and with the power of great growth in it; we have a certain taste for art, so that pottery is made and drawings executed; a human reason, family affection, the capacity of organization and society, the ability for arts, manufacture, and commerce, and, though the Bushman is a creature, owing to bad diet and unfortunate circumstances, among the very lowest of the human race, we have, so far as one can see, a being with all the illimitable capacities of man, and destined for immortal progress. On the other hand is a creature, divided mentally and spiritually from the Bushman by an almost immeasurable gulf; without language or art or society or religion; in his constructive instincts not equal to some of his "fellow-mutes" with much smaller brains; in social capacities inferior to some of the insects; in moral qualities not equal to a (physically) much lower animal (the dog), and in reasoning power surpassed apparently by the dog and the elephant; — a being, so far as human experience reaches, with only the slightest capacity for progress. If the mind and soul be dependent on the cerebral structure, how happens it that two beings so much alike in physical structure should be so immensely apart in mental and moral development? If it be replied that transmitted speech is the great ground of difference between man and "the mute," still the transmutationists must show why a physical constitution so similar and a brain so corresponding to the human should not have invented or transmitted language.

These writers, in their eagerness to carry out the development theory to its utmost extent, have overdrawn the degradation of the lowest human races, and exaggerated their incapacity for progress. It cannot be certainly said yet that any human variety is incapable of an immense growth. Individuals of the lowest African tribes — as the Congo negroes in this country — have at times equalled the highest races in their mental development.

The gulf thus far between the Australian, the Andaman Islander, the Bushman, or the Digger Indian and the anthro-

poid apes is vast beyond almost all measurement, while it must be admitted that the physical difference is very small. Here is a link gone in the chain of materialistic reasoning. Here fairly and philosophically the inference may be drawn of forces existing which cannot be accounted for by physical derivation.

Nor will the supposition of an intermediate "missing form" help the transmutationists, as the cerebral structure is sufficiently correspondent and similar to produce, under their theory, necessary corresponding mental results.

Mr. Wallace, one of the most extreme of the Darwinians in England, admits that, at the point where, in the course of human development, mind first appeared, and natural selection worked upon mental faculties rather than upon profitable bodily changes, there was the greatest revolution which the earth has ever witnessed. There, at least, is one "cataclysm" in human history. There surely may have been inserted the supernatural power.

We admit it to be a purely scientific question. It may be, for all we know, just as consistent with the Divine attributes to create the soul through gradual development by means of natural selection from the instincts of lower orders of animals, as it is to create the body in a similar manner, or to develop the wonderful human brain and body from a cell which cannot be distinguished from the cell of the turtle. It is purely a matter of evidence. Here is a gap which has not thus far been crossed. Is it not scientific to bridge it with a "sufficient cause"?

All the German writers we have quoted, — Vogt, Büchner, Haeckel, and others, — dwell with more or less concealed elation on one great service, as they suppose, of the Darwinian theory, — that it has removed the necessity of an intelligent Creator from the theory of the universe. It gives a painful idea of the intellectual and moral status of a people, when the prospect of destroying the faith of mankind in a God is received with cheerful enthusiasm; and it is evident that we have here a reaction against bigotry which is as morbid and unnatural as was the ecclesiastical superstition it attacked.

Darwin himself does not share these extreme views of his

German followers. In the Preface to one of his editions of the Origin of Species, he avows his belief in a personal Creator, and, what is more to the purpose, at the close of his last great work on Animals and Plants under Domestication, he alludes to some of the difficulties which have met his mind, in reconciling the theory of an omniscient, benevolent, and all-disposing Creator with "a plasticity of organization, leading to many injurious deviations of structure," and "a redundant reproduction," from which arises "the survival of the fittest"; but consoles himself that these are difficulties of a similar class which meet one in regard to "free will and predestination." To his mind, plainly, the great hypothesis does not exclude the necessity of a Creator, though it presents difficulties which are equally great under the usual moral theories of Providence.

It is plain that the *Paleyan* theory of creation, and the form of the celebrated "argument from design," must now be dropped. The wonderful contrivances of the organic and inorganic world are not precisely like the works of a watch, which a person examining says must have had a direct intelligent maker. It is rather as if a man found a series of watches of such wonderful mechanism, that each one came forth from the preceding, and was the product of its machinery; or as if one examining the complicated works of a large factory should search for its originating power, through wheel after wheel, band after band, lever after lever, until he came by a long process to the fall of water or the force of gravity. Such wonderful adaptations as those of the white partridge to the snow, the green insect to the leaf, the wingless beetles to the windy coasts of an island, the corollas of the red clover to the humble-bee, the curious "mimicries" by one species of insects of another, preserving them from enemies, the instinct of the hive-bee in the structure of its cell, or such homologies of structure as exist between all the branches of the vertebrate family, together with countless other ingenious contrivances and adaptations, are not to be looked upon as intermediate contrivances of an intelligent Creator to produce such and such results. They are the effects of an immense series of forces, balancing and counterbalancing, opposing and combining, through count-

less æons; the final fruits of such laws as the continued transmission of the cells of each organism, the immense overproduction of all forms of life, the change of each by forces known and unknown, the necessary destruction of all unsuited to their circumstances, and the survival of such forms or organisms as are best suited to their conditions.

There is, indeed, a machinery of nature, a clock-work which speaks of an inventor, but a machinery complicated, interdependent, boundless, wherein every wheel, even the smallest, is the work of the balancing of forces without number, and each cog and spring is the fruit of agencies millions of centuries old. The Inventor is there, but much farther away than our former science taught. His hand is equally necessary to explain the machinery, but it works with more wonderful tools and in more complicated methods than the age of Paley knew. The blind forces which act in this astonishing manner, and are convertible from one to the other, must still be traced back to the originating Force. The first cell of *life*, with all its boundless capacities and unseen forces, must be explained. The wonderful plan must be accounted for.

Even the most bitter of the German atheists admit that there is throughout all the records of fossil life, and all the arrangements of the present kingdoms of life, clear evidence of a steady, continuous PROGRESS. The laws of differentiation and progressive growth, though showing occasional exceptions, lie clearly at the basis of creation. In the physical, mental, and moral world there has been from the beginning, and there must be forevermore, an eternal growth or improvement. No Darwinian can deny this. What higher evidence of an intelligent, benevolent, all-wise Creator than a physical and moral creation, based on laws of infinite progress?

It is true that in this, as in other reasonings on origin, we are not to take our *a priori* conceptions. The Divine Architect does not apparently plan from the beginning (as we might have expected) the size and shape and fitness of each stone in his wonderful edifice. He appears, on the contrary, to arrange forces which are continually shaping and reshaping the countless blocks; some come forth imperfect, some crumble and

become material for other uses, some have no apparent connection with his plan; many seem tentative, others even obscure, and injure the harmony; still at length, through all the confusion and destruction, stone is laid upon stone, here one for lintel, there another for arch, here for strength, there for beauty; columns, arches, and pinnacles appear, and at length a structure of matchless symmetry, harmony, beauty, and grandeur rises from the ruin below; one never to our view completed, but always rising imperceptibly to greater perfection.

In attempting to conceive the divine plans of the great Architect, we are of course in a region where human faculties reach but little way; yet it seems a possible conception of an infinite Creator, that he should be able to arrange forces on a general plan, whose particular results he should clearly foresee; even knowing the future failures and half-effects of these "laws" which he sustains, while the great object of Progress and Completeness is being steadily worked out.*

How any one could regard the Darwinian conception of the Creator as an inferior one we cannot understand. To our mind, the vast, manifold, almost infinite intertwining of causes, which under that theory should produce the most simple effects; the astonishing and incredible complication and interdependence of the kingdoms of life which Darwin has attempted to illustrate; the thought that the destruction of a single thread in the infinite network of forces would desolate the earth of beautiful forms of life, or would over-people it with hideous; that each little violet, for instance, which gladdens our eye on a country walk has depended for its existence on a balancing and interworking of innumerable forms of life during "ages of ages," and is the result of laws old as creation; and that there is at the centre ONE holding the tangled threads of this vast net-

* "That proposition is, that the whole world, living and not living, is the result of the mutual interaction, according to definite laws, of the forces possessed by the molecules of which the primitive nebulosity of the universe was composed. If this be true, it is no less certain that the existing world lay, potentially, in the cosmic vapor; and that a sufficient intelligence could, from a knowledge of the properties of the molecules of that vapor, have predicted, say the state of the fauna of Britain in 1869, with as much certainty as one can say what will happen to the vapor of the breath in a cold winter's day." — HUXLEY, *in the Academy*.

work of causes, or rather that the power which is continually weaving on this immense "loom of life" is One, — to us such a scientific conception has in it something corresponding to our highest moral intuition of HIM the "All-controlling."

> Wer darf IHN nennen? . . . .
> Der ALLUMFASSER!
> Der ALLERHALTER!

C. L. BRACE.

ART. IV. — 1. *History of the Legal-Tender Paper Money issued during the great Rebellion, being a Loan without Interest, and a National Currency.* Prepared by HON. E. G. SPAULDING, Chairman of the Sub-committee of Ways and Means at the Time the Act was passed. Buffalo. 1869.

2. *Opinion delivered in the Supreme Court of the United States by* CHIEF JUSTICE CHASE, *on the 7th of February*, 1870, *in Regard to the Construction of the Legal-Tender Act.*

DURING the Rebellion the United States armies suffered many disasters in the field, which for the moment were felt as direct and personal misfortunes by every loyal citizen. So strong was the public feeling of anger and astonishment, that Congress appointed committees of investigation, to examine into the causes of these military failures, and subjected the whole conduct of the war to a searching and sometimes a severe criticism. In finance, on the other hand, the nation suffered only one great disaster, but its effects have extended far beyond the period of the war, and are likely to be felt with unmitigated force for an indefinite time yet to come. The causes of this catastrophe have not been investigated by Congress; but as the day may probably come when the national government will have been forced to accept the fact that the act of national bankruptcy was a calamity so terrible as to involve the personal and political credit of every man in whose charge the people had then placed the common interests, it may be useful to point out the path which the future congressional committee on the conduct of the finances will be compelled to follow in

investigating the causes which led to that miscarriage, the results of which have far exceeded in importance the defeat of any of the national armies or the failure of any campaign. The timid and hesitating criticism with which the subject has been commonly treated speaks ill for the sound sense of the community. The public has so thoroughly adopted the idea that it is itself the responsible governing power, and its representatives only delegates to enroll its orders, that the healthy process of criticising a policy once adopted seems to it almost an attack on its own authority. The confusion of ideas involved in this assumption of responsibility is peculiarly unfortunate. The task of citizens who are selected to govern is one thing. They bear the burden of leaders, and they enjoy the honor. They are, too, at liberty to excuse or palliate their mistakes, their ignorance, or their crimes by whatever argument they can make to answer their purpose. But the task of the public is wholly different. It is that of insisting, without favor or prejudice, on the observance of truth in legislation and in the execution of the laws. To apply the principles of truth in criticism is the first duty of every writer for the press and every speaker on the hustings. Whatever seems harsh in criticism or vehement in temper may be excused in the citizen who clings to the rigid logic of fundamental principles, and who leaves to those whose public conduct fails to reach his standard, the labor of justifying themselves in the best way they can.

It is customary, however, for critics of American finance to begin at this point with the assumption that the Legal-Tender Act was necessary and inevitable. As a matter of criticism, nothing can be more absurd than such a beginning; and as a matter of intelligence, nothing can be feebler. Congress and the country permitted no such assumption to be made in excuse for the beaten generals at Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville. There can be no satisfactory conclusion from such a premise. No sound result can be reached except by assuming at the outset that the Legal-Tender Act was not necessary; that the public was not responsible for it; that the men who made it law were answerable to the people for their act, and are bound to show that so extraordinary and so grave a misfortune

could, by no means, have been avoided. If they fail to prove their case, they are condemned. It is, too, a matter of the greatest consequence to decide what the ultimate judgment will be, since on it must turn not only questions of the most considerable material interests, but points of fundamental law in the United States, and of the theory of government for future time. The urgent necessity of establishing some fixed principles in regard to this disease of debased currency may be measured by the extent of the disease itself. Russia, Austria, Turkey, Italy, Spain, Brazil, Japan, and an indefinite number of smaller communities, besides the United States, have, to-day, no fixed standard of value in domestic exchanges. With rare exceptions, no government that has once debased its standard has ever restored it, except through the desperate resource of partial or entire repudiation. Unless the world is prepared to agree that society has no protection, and that the assumed progress of political science is a mere dream, there can be no excuse for continuing to accept as inevitable an evil which, in all times, has been merely the result of ignorance and misgovernment.

The law of legal tender, passed by Congress in February, 1862, cannot, therefore, be assumed to have been necessary, and its supporters are bound to prove that they had no alternative. To this task Mr. Spaulding, the principal author of the measure, has applied himself; while, on the other hand, Mr. Chase, without whose assent the law could not have passed, has assumed the contrary ground. There is, unfortunately, at the outset a strong presumption against the law, rising from the unquestionable fact that the men who, in 1862, were charged with the conduct of the finances, and were responsible for this law in particular, had no claim to confidence on the ground of their financial knowledge or experience. Something better might indeed have been expected among a people so devoted to commerce and so habituated to self-government. Military disasters were to be looked for, seeing that the nation had no training nor taste for war; but though war, or art, or philosophy, or abstract knowledge, were beyond the range of public or popular interest, an experience of two hundred years ought at least to have insured the country against mistakes in

practical politics. Such, however, was very far from the truth. Among the leading statesmen then charged with responsibility, not one was, by training, well fitted to perform the duties of finance minister, or to guide the financial opinions of Congress. The Secretary of the Treasury, certainly the most capable of the men then connected with finance, suffered severely under the disadvantage of inexperience. In the Senate, finance, like every other subject, was treated rather as though it were a branch of the common or constitutional law, than as though it were a system with established principles and processes of its own. But it was in the House of Representatives that the want of education was most apparent and most mischievous, while, by a significant coincidence, it happens that the law of legal tender, more than almost any other great financial measure of the Rebellion, was peculiarly and essentially the work of this House. As for the members who originated and whose activity carried through all opposition the act of February, 1862, it is difficult to characterize them in language which would not seem unduly and unreasonably severe. Yet it may honestly be doubted whether there has ever been a time since Kleon, the leather-seller, was sent by the people of Athens to command its armies at Sphacteria and Amphipolis, and since Aristophanes on the public stage covered the powerful popular leader with an immortal ridicule which surely reflected most severely on the Athenian people itself, — it may honestly be doubted whether history records an occasion when the interests of a great country in an extreme emergency have been committed to hands more eminently disqualified for the trust. In February, 1862, Mr. Thaddeus Stevens was chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, from which emanates the ordinary financial legislation of Congress. To say that Mr. Stevens was as little suited to direct the economical policy of the country at a critical moment, as a naked Indian from the plains to plan the architecture of St. Peter's or to direct the construction of the Capitol, would express in no extreme language the degree of his unfitness. That Mr. Stevens was grossly ignorant upon all economical subjects and principles was the least of his deficiencies. A dogmatic mind, a high temper, and an overbearing will are three serious disqualifi-

cations for financial success, especially when combined with contempt for financial knowledge. It is no exaggeration to say, that every quality of his nature and every incident of his life which gave Mr. Stevens power in the House, where he was almost omnipotent in the legislation which belonged to the war and to reconstruction, conspired to unfit him for the deliberate and difficult discussions of finance. But it is not to Mr. Stevens that the principal burden of blame or praise for the financial legislation of that momentous year is to be awarded. In the press of business upon the committee, when in the brief space of a few months the whole system of loans, of taxation, and of currency, demanded by a war of such tremendous proportions, had to be created, so to speak, out of nothing, two sub-committees were formed to divide the duties which fell upon the committee. One of these, under the lead of Mr. Morrill of Vermont, undertook to enlarge and adjust the scheme of taxation to the new necessities of the government. The other, under the chairmanship of the Hon. Elbridge G. Spaulding of New York, assumed the care of the national currency, the raising of loans, and the issue of treasury notes or bonds. Mr. Stevens remained chairman of the whole committee, charging himself particularly with the matter of appropriations, and lending his powerful voice to both sections below him, as either by turn encountered opposition in forcing its measures through the House.

The intellect of a Congressman, gifted with no more than the ordinary abilities of his class, is scarcely an interesting or instructive subject of study; nor are the discussions that arise among such men likely to be rich in stores of knowledge or experience. But when an accidental representative, though he may possess neither breadth nor force, is able to carry "over the administration and through Congress," as Mr. Spaulding claims to have done, and as it is clear that Mr. Spaulding did, a measure of such far-reaching consequences as the Legal-Tender Act of 1862, the character of that person's mind and the facts of his life cease to be matters of absolute insignificance. One may well inquire what sort of a man it was that could lead a nation so far astray, and what the condition of things that made it possible to effect results of such magnitude. Financiers who

make an addition of hundreds of millions of dollars to the debts of their countries, representing not a penny of value enjoyed, are entitled to a place in history, whether they boast the intellectual capacity of Mr. Pitt or of Mr. Spaulding.

Unlike Mr. Stevens, Mr. Spaulding had the advantage or disadvantage of a certain sort of financial experience. He had been for a time treasurer of the State of New York. By profession he was, in 1862, president of a joint-stock bank at Buffalo, and it was on this circumstance that he based his chief claim to speak as an expert in finance. At the conference on the 11th of January, 1862, at the treasury, between the Secretary, the committees of Congress, and the representatives of the principal Northern banks, — a conference whose momentous importance will require close attention, — Mr. Spaulding expressed his convictions both "as a banker and legislator." The association of functions was not unimportant, and Mr. Spaulding was right in laying stress upon it. Had he not been a banker as well as a legislator, the Legal-Tender Act might, it is not improbable, never have been enacted. Being a provincial banker, and at the same time chairman of a sub-committee dealing with the nominally financial but really universal interests of thirty millions or more of citizens, and dealing, too, with the whole future of a nation whose development no bounds seem to limit, Mr. Spaulding naturally proceeded to apply to the necessities of the situation the principles of finance which he had learned in shaving notes at a country bank.

These necessities were unquestionably serious, but few persons now retain any distinct recollection of their actual shape. To the minds of men living in 1870 the events of 1862 appear bound up in close connection with the long series of events that have intervened. The necessity of the Legal-Tender Act is now assumed, not on account of what had happened before the law was passed, nor on account of anything that was foreseen by its authors, but because of what afterwards occurred, the exigencies of a situation far more difficult and alarming than existed at that earlier time. Against such a confusion of ideas it is necessary that every candid man should be on his guard. The vague, general notion that, sooner or later, legal-tender paper was inevitable, is a part of the same loose and slovenly popular

criticism with which the whole subject has been so habitually treated, and is scarcely worth comment; but the actual circumstances under which Congress declared the measure to be necessary are a matter of fact, and it is with these that law, history, and political science have first of all to deal.

Congress met on the 2d of December, 1861, and the Secretary immediately set before it an account of the financial situation, and his own scheme for supplying the wants of the treasury. He required about $200,000,000, in addition to resources already provided, in order to meet the demands of the next half-year. His immediate necessity was for $100,000,000 within three months. He estimated that the debt would reach $517,000,000 on the 1st of July, 1862, and that a year later it would probably become $900,000,000. In fact, it rose to $1,100,000,000. A part of the heavy government expenses were to be met by taxation; a part by the sale of bonds; and for the rest Mr. Chase proposed the assumption by the government of the bank circulation, amounting to some $200,000,000, with a view not only of obtaining the money, but of providing a sound currency on which to conduct the war. The Secretary did not, in this connection, overlook the possibility of resorting to a forced paper circulation, but "the immeasurable evils of dishonored public faith and national bankruptcy" deterred him from recommending the measure, or rather obliged him to reject it as dangerous and unnecessary.

Thus, on the 1st of December, 1861, according to the Secretary of the Treasury, no occasion existed for resorting even to the moderate measure of issuing government paper at all, except so far as concerned a possible guaranty to a new bank circulation. The idea of legal tender was expressly rejected. The government believed itself able to meet its demands on the basis of the bank circulation, provided Congress would place the bank circulation on an available footing. Nothing, however, was done by Congress towards supplying the wants of the treasury, until, towards the end of December, Mr. Spaulding began to draft a bill for establishing a national banking currency. While preparing this draft, Mr. Spaulding, "upon mature reflection, came to the conclusion that the bill could not be passed and made available quick enough to meet the crisis then

pressing upon the government for money to sustain the army and navy. He therefore drafted a legal-tender treasury note section." This was done about the 30th December; and this was the origin of the measure destined to have so vast and permanent an influence on the American people. The "mature reflection" of Mr. Spaulding could discover no other or better method of supplying a temporary want of $100,000,000, than a resort to the last expedient known to finance; what he himself calls a forced loan, made in the first year of the war by means which were equivalent to a debasement of the standard of value and a bankruptcy of the government. It is scarcely necessary to add a comment upon this simple statement. Any reader in the least familiar with financial history must appreciate the extravagance of Mr. Spaulding's assumption. That he acted with perfect honesty and good intention no one will think it worth while to dispute; but that he had the least conception of the consequences of what he was doing, or that he grasped even in a limited degree the principles of statesmanship, no unprejudiced or cool observer could imagine. Like all ignorant men, impatient of resistance or restraint, the moment he saw an obstacle, he knew but one resource, that of a blind and reckless appeal to force.

Mr. Spaulding then, "upon more mature consideration," converted the section into a separate bill, and laid it before his committee. The committee, however, was by no means unanimous in accepting Mr. Spaulding's views of necessity. It is true, and it is an interesting fact, that the only doubt entertained by Mr. Thaddeus Stevens was in regard to the constitutionality of the law; and one is somewhat at a loss whether most to wonder at the profound ignorance thus betrayed or at the constitutional scruples which suggested themselves to this veteran expunger of constitutions. But though Mr. Stevens and one half the committee approved the bill, the other half stood out firmly against it, and only as a matter of courtesy allowed it to be reported to the House.

On the 7th of January, 1862, the bill was reported. It authorized the issue of $100,000,000 in treasury notes, to be a legal tender, and exchangeable on demand for six per cent bonds. Public opinion at once became sharply divided on the merits of

the measure. Delegates from the Boards of Trade and banks of the principal Northern cities appeared in Washington to oppose the bill, and on the 11th of January these gentlemen met the Secretary of the Treasury and the finance committees of the Senate and House, at Mr. Chase's office in the department. Here the whole financial policy of the government was made a subject of discussion, and the two paths between which the country was still at liberty to choose were marked out with unmistakable precision. Mr. Spaulding, on the one hand, insisted not only that his measure was the best, but that it was the only means of raising the money required, and he demanded to know what alternative could be suggested. On the part of the bank committees, Mr. James Gallatin, of New York, submitted a complete financial scheme, and, with the plain common sense of a practical man, replied to Mr. Spaulding's inquiry with the simple proposal that the government should sell its bonds in the open market for what they would bring, without limitation of price. To this suggestion Mr. Spaulding made a response which must be quoted word for word, since it probably contains the most extraordinary revelation of ignorance and folly that has been offered in a century past by a principal legislator for a great nation: —

"The Sub-Committee of Ways and Means, through Mr. Spaulding, objected to any and every form of 'shinning' by government through Wall or State Streets, to begin with; objected to the knocking down of government stocks to seventy-five or sixty cents on the dollar, the inevitable result of throwing a new and large loan on the market without limitation as to price; claimed for treasury notes as much virtue of par value as the notes of banks which have suspended specie payments, but which yet circulate in the trade of the North; *and finished with firmly refusing to assent to any scheme which should permit a speculation by brokers, bankers, and others in the government securities, and particularly any scheme which should double the public debt of the country, and double the expenses of the war, by damaging the credit of the government* to the extent of sending it to 'shin' through the shaving-shops of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia. He affirmed his conviction as a banker and legislator, that it was the lawful policy as well as the manifest duty of the government, in the present exigency, to legalize as tender its fifty millions issue of demand treasury notes, authorized at the extra session in July last, and to add to this stock of

legal tender, immediately, one hundred millions more. *He thought that this financial measure would carry the country through the war, and save its credit and dignity.* At the same time we should insist upon taxation abundantly ample to pay the expenses of the government on a peace footing, and interest of every dollar of the public obligation, and to give this generation a clear show of a speedy liquidation of the public debt."

Before commenting further upon this speech, it is necessary to mark with care the fact that throughout the whole legal-tender contest in 1862, there was no question involved but that of *resource*. The sum of one hundred million dollars was wanted to carry on the government, and Mr. Spaulding closed every mouth by asking how else the money could be raised, since the banks could provide no more coin and their paper would not properly answer the purpose. At this time there was no thought of any ulterior process of "floating the bonds," which became the ultimate function of the legal-tender paper, and indeed this argument, which implied an intentional depreciation of the paper, would in 1862 have scarcely worked in favor of the bill. How little weight was put on the idea of "making money easy" is evident from the whole debate, but so far as Mr. Spaulding is concerned, the following letter, written on the 8th of January, 1862, is a sufficiently clear statement: —

"Dear Sir, — In reply to yours of the 4th instant, I would say that the Treasury Note Bill for $ 100,000,000 agreed upon in committee yesterday is a measure of *necessity* and not one of *choice*. You criticise matters very freely, and very likely you may be right in what you say. We will be out of means to pay the daily expenses in *about thirty days*, and the committee do not see any other way to get along till we can get the tax bills ready, except to issue temporarily treasury notes. Perhaps you can suggest some other mode of carrying on the government for the next one hundred days. . . . . It is much easier to *find fault* than it is to suggest *practicable means or measures*. We must have at least $ 100,000,000 during the next three months, or the government must stop payment. . . . . I will thank you to suggest a better *practicable* mode of getting $ 100,000,000 of paying means during the next three months. I would be glad to adopt it, and the committee would be glad to adopt it. Let us have *your specific plan* for this purpose, one that will produce the money, and we will be very much obliged to you."

This curious letter, which, strange to say, Mr. Spaulding has actually published, italics and all, as a document of great merit, tells the whole story of the legal tender in its origin. As a specimen of American finance and congressional ability it will live in history, Mr. Spaulding may be sure. It presents the view on which, then as now, the adherents of this measure have always wished to place it before the public, — as the only alternative to the immediate stoppage of government. Not as a means of supplying currency, nor of easing the money market, nor of "floating" bonds, was the legal-tender paper first created, but solely to supply a temporary want of $100,000,000, without which the treasury must stop payments. And Mr. Spaulding flung into the face of every doubter his contemptuous request to suggest some better mode of raising the money, or in future to keep silence.

Three days after this letter was written, Mr. Gallatin, on the part of the New York banks, replied to Mr. Spaulding's wild entreaties by the simple and business-like remark of a man who knew what he was talking about, that it was only necessary for Mr. Chase to sell his bonds at their market value, and obtain what money he wanted. To this suggestion Mr. Spaulding was called upon for a rejoinder. Obviously he was bound to show that Mr. Gallatin was mistaken; that no such alternative really existed; and that it was, for some reason or other, impossible to sell the government bonds in the way proposed. In the speech which has just been quoted Mr. Spaulding did undertake to answer Mr. Gallatin, but he took no such ground as this. He did not deny the efficacy of the proposed measure. He did not even question the fact that the resource suggested was both simple and easy. He only appealed to the dignity of the government.

It appears, therefore, that there was an alternative to legal tender, in spite of Mr. Spaulding's assertions that there was none. What this alternative consisted in will be discussed in a moment; but as the point is most material in the argument, it will be well to establish here beyond dispute the fact that the existence of this alternative was acknowledged by the supporters of the bill almost in the same breath with which they declared legal tender to be a necessity. In his speech of the

28th January, on introducing the bill into the House of Representatives, Mr. Spaulding said: —

"The bill before us is a war measure, a measure of *necessity*, and not of choice. . . . . *We have the alternative* either to go into the market and sell our bonds for what they will command, or to pass this bill. . . . . If you offer to the people and put upon the market $ 300,000,000 to the highest bidder in the present state of affairs, they would not be taken except at ruinous rates of discount. . . . . I fear the twenty years six per cent bonds would under the pressure fall to 75, 70, 60 and even 50 cents. . . . . Why, then, go into the streets at all to borrow money! I prefer to assert the power and dignity of the government by the issue of its own notes."

Mr. Hooper, who was second on Mr. Spaulding's committee, said: —

"The propositions of committees from boards of trade and banks, which recently visited Washington, differed from the theory of this bill so far as to require that . . . . the government bonds must first be disposed of, and the money received for them paid to the contractors. . . . . The obvious effect of such an arrangement would be to put the reins of our national finances in the hands of the banks. . . . . *To render the government financially more independent*, it is necessary to make the United States notes a legal tender. *It is possible that they would become a practical tender without providing for them to be a legal tender.*"

The alternative, therefore, as seen by Mr. Hooper, was not between legal tender and a stoppage of payments, but between legal tender and dependence on the banks. Mr. Bingham's idea of necessity was only a little more ridiculous: —

"Great names," said Mr. Bingham, "have been invoked [against legal tender] in this debate. For what purpose? For the purpose of laying at the feet and at the mercy of brokers and hawkers on 'Change, the power of the people over their monetary interests in this hour of their national exigency."

Mr. Thaddeus Stevens, again, had views of his own in regard to the meaning of the word "necessity": —

"This bill," said he, "is a measure of necessity, not of choice. . . . . *Here, then, in a few words lies your* CHOICE. Throw bonds at six or seven per cent on the market between this and December enough to raise

at least $ 600,000,000, or issue United States notes. . . . . I maintain that the highest sum you could sell your bonds at would be seventy-five per cent, payable in currency itself at a discount. That would produce a loss which no nation or individual doing a large business could stand a year."

Senator Sherman also used the word "necessity" in a sense which would have been ludicrous if the subject had concerned the metaphysical doctrine of fate and free will: "We must no longer hesitate as to the necessity of this measure. That necessity does exist, and now presses upon us. I rest my vote upon the proposition that this is a necessary and proper measure *to furnish a currency.*" A more amusing example of anticlimax than this is seldom seen in rhetoric.

It would be pleasant to linger over this subject, and call out of these apparently tedious speeches the delicate touches of involuntary humor which a critic finds so difficult to resist, but it is useless to accumulate evidence of a point that is self-evident; and it is unquestionable that even the strongest supporters of the bill did not in any true and absolute sense maintain that legal tender was necessary, but only that it was preferable to the process of selling bonds at a discount and retaining the old bank currency. The next step, therefore, must lead to some closer discussion of this opinion, and of the financial principles by which its justice can alone be tested.

Finance is a subject which the liveliest writer may well despair of making popular, since the mere sight or suspicion of it is alone enough to cause every reader, except the dullest, to close the most promising volume. A writer, therefore, can have no hope of gaining a general hearing on such a topic. Rarely can he expect sympathy among even business men, unless he adopts the views they hold. Yet notwithstanding this, it is and will remain true, and not only true but interesting, that in the large experience of modern nations, some few solid principles in finance have been established too firmly to be shaken; and whether or no busy politicians or local bankers choose to believe them, and whether or no the ordinary reader choose to listen to them, the principles are sound and will hold.

Hitherto in human history, the mind of man has succeeded

in conceiving of but two means by which governments can obtain money. One of these is, to take. The other is, to borrow. The hybrid and self-contradictory notion of a forced loan resolves itself ultimately into one or the other of these conceptions, and as a permanent policy is impossible. In practice, where a government does not take, it must borrow.

Almost all modern nations are, to a greater or less extent, habitual borrowers so far as their governments are concerned, and therefore it is natural that, during two hundred years of experience, the principles which regulate loans should have been studied with some care, and simplified in some degree into a science. After innumerable costly experiments and elaborate study of the interests and motives of lenders and borrowers, the effect of complicated financial schemes and special pledges and conditions, it seems to be now acknowledged by the shrewdest governments that the simplest bargain is the best for the public, and that all financial tricks and devices, all attempts to coax or deceive capitalists into better conditions than they are ready to offer, in the end injure only the government and the public. Simplicity has, therefore, of late years been carried by the great borrowing nations to a degree of scientific perfection beyond which there seems to be no possibility of passing. According to this principle, governments now sell their own credit without stipulation, reserve, or condition. They sell, for example, their simple promise to pay a thousand dollars a year so long as it is demanded. To this promise no condition, expressed or implied, is attached, except that the payment of a nominal principal may at any time discharge the debt. For this promise they obtain whatever they can, and experience has proved that, in the competition of the world, the bargain thus struck is for both parties the fairest.

Another simple law has also been established, and this is that lenders will always prefer and pay most for a security on which there is a certainty of permanence or a chance of profit, other things being equal; that is to say, that a security is relatively less valuable as it approaches its par and its redemption than it should be, judging from the price paid for an exactly similar security which has a better chance of perma-

nence or a wider limit of possible profit. The English 3 per cents at eighty would commonly have a marked advantage in the market over 3½ per cents; in the first place, because the margin of possible profit would be greater, and in the second place, because there would be no prospect of disturbance in the one case, while in the other redemption would be near at hand. Experience, therefore, shows that governments as a rule obtain relatively a low price for a security which they insist upon selling at par.

This obvious fact induces most governments to adapt their offer to the market in such a way as to combine these inducements. If the market rate of interest is at 4 per cent, they commonly offer 3½ or 3 per cent, and thus dispose of their credit at a discount on better terms than if they attempted to outbid the market rate. The American government, on the other hand, has commonly pursued a different course. While insisting that it will borrow only at the market rate, that is, at par, it has found itself compelled to concede something in order to be allowed to borrow at all. It accepts, therefore, the condition that it shall not attempt to redeem its bonds until after the lapse of a term of years, — five or ten, or whatever may be agreed upon. The expedient is clumsy, but the ignorant prejudice against usury compels its adoption, although, like all such devices, it works in practice only against the public interest and in favor of the capitalist. Another condition, however, to which the United States government is in the habit of pledging itself is entirely gratuitous. This is the obligation to redeem after a certain term of years, — an obligation which works wholly against the public interest, and which is without excuse on financial grounds, although the incessant enforcement of a temporary character in the national debt is considered its excuse from a political stand-point.

Every established principle of finance, therefore, indicated that government credit could be sold to more advantage at a certain nominal discount than if a higher interest or any equivalent condition were insisted upon in order to "float" it at par. If, therefore, the government had chosen to authorize the sale of six per cent bonds at their market price, omitting from the contract all restriction on its own free control over

them, it would have done precisely what all established financial rules enjoin, and for such bonds it would unquestionably have obtained the best terms which were then to be had, while at the present day it would have had a homogeneous debt, with which it would have been free to deal as it chose. Mr. Spaulding, however, apparently imagined that he had discovered some new principle in finance, by which the government might raise money through a process which should be neither taxation nor loan. Before three years had passed the government was selling its six per cent bonds at a rate equivalent to very nearly thirty-five cents on the dollar; but at this time the idea of its credit selling at a discount of twenty or thirty or forty per cent was so revolting to Congress that it was not even to be entertained. Mr. Gallatin talked in vain. Nor was it Mr. Spaulding and members of Congress alone who were extravagant on this theme. At least one gentleman who should have known better, — Mr. Moses H. Grinnell of New York, — encouraged the same delusion. "As for G[allatin] and a few egotistical gentlemen that act with him, they should be driven out of Washington, as they only embarrass the government. There are not eight bank presidents that side with G[allatin]. He is an odd fish, — has very little influence here." These were the terms used by Mr. Grinnell in a letter dated the 30th January, 1862, and it was a curious sign of the times that the only man who seems to have had a clear and practical knowledge of what the occasion required should have really been "an odd fish."

But it is not enough to show that this idea about "shinning" through Wall Street was almost inconceivably absurd, seeing that every government always does and always must borrow on the best terms it can get, or not borrow at all, in which case it can have no resource but to tax. The event soon showed that the men who treated so contemptuously the idea of the nation's credit being sold at a discount were the first to convert this same legal-tender paper into the instrument by which the government was to "shin," not only through Wall Street during the short emergency of the war, but through every lane and alley of the land during a period that now seems interminable. Congress and the government

followed Mr. Spaulding's doctrine, that the nation's credit must not be sold at a discount, and the result was that, as the laws of society are inflexible, while the laws of Congress are not omnipotent, there ensued a period of "shinning" which has seldom had a parallel. The dollar which Congress had set up was "shaved" through Wall Street at twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, and sixty cents discount. Europe bought the United States six per cents at about thirty-five cents on the dollar, notwithstanding Mr. Stevens's asseverations that no nation could afford to borrow at seventy without being ruined in a year. But if Mr. Spaulding and his friends could have foreseen, not only that the government would be compelled to perform this process of "shinning" during four long years, but that, thanks to them and to them alone, the government credit and its broken promises-to-pay would for years longer be hawked about Wall Street at whatever price they could command, and would become the support by which Mr. Jay Gould and Mr. James Fisk, Jr., and their like, would succeed in bolstering up their scandalous schemes against the pressure of sound economical laws, the statesmen of 1862 might perhaps have gained more sensible ideas in regard to the treatment of government credit.

In justice to the Secretary of the Treasury, it must be said that, on the day of the conference, he showed no symptom of yielding to Mr. Spaulding's influence. He remained then as before hostile to the principle of legal tender, and before the bank delegates left Washington he succeeded in agreeing with them upon a new financial arrangement which included the adoption of his policy in regard to the bank currency, and rejected the resort to legal tender. Nor would it perhaps have affected the success of this scheme, that Mr. Spaulding and his committee deemed it inadequate and withheld their assent. There was a different reason than this, which caused the compromise between Mr. Chase and the banks to fail. The gentleman who represented the Boston banks on that occasion found on his return to Massachusetts that the arrangement he had made was not satisfactory to them, and he at once telegraphed this information to the Secretary. Then for the first time Mr. Chase yielded his better judgment, and, relying on his own

power and will to control the issues, accepted the policy of legal tender, for which Boston influence thus became immediately answerable. Having once made his determination to adopt the policy, the Secretary was not a man to hesitate in carrying it out. He had been drawn into it against his most deeply rooted convictions and his better judgment, but no sooner was the decision made than he threw his whole weight in favor of the bill.

Thus, in spite of the treasury and the banks and the active remonstrances of a great part of the community, the bill came before the House of Representatives as a government measure. Two months of delay and confusion had seriously complicated the difficulties of the case, but even yet no necessity existed which could in any just sense be considered to exact the adoption of legal tender. The cry of necessity was indeed raised, and prolonged without a pause, but it was raised merely because no solid argument could be found. The ablest members of Congress denied the necessity without qualification, and, as has already been shown, the ideas of necessity held by the different supporters of the bill were almost as various as the speeches.

The debate began on the 28th of January, by a speech from Mr. Spaulding, in which he explained at considerable length his reasons for forcing on the country a measure which was so generally obnoxious. There seems to be something almost extravagant in so often recalling attention to Mr. Spaulding's speeches, which, except for their absurdities, have no intrinsic claim to notice. But Mr. Spaulding was at this moment in a position of vast responsibility. His activity and persistence had carried the bill "over the administration," and were now to carry it through the House. It is not easy, therefore, to set him aside as a person of no consequence, or to pass his opinions by as undeserving of attention; and indeed, however far beneath criticism these opinions may have been, Mr. Spaulding has a perfect right to claim that they were little if at all inferior in merit to those expressed by the other friends of the bill. It is true that if any object were to be gained by reviewing this ground, if it were intended to conciliate support for new opinions, or to lay down principles for a new party, it

would be well to speak in milder terms of men whose power and authority have not yet passed wholly away. But the only inquiry that can have value here is to ask how the future historian will be compelled to treat this chapter of American history; and, unless the world is to move backward, it seems as though he must inevitably declare that not all the campaigns of all the unfortunate or incompetent generals employed during the Rebellion can furnish an instance of grosser mistreatment than was offered by Congress in these debates. The good sense and high moral standard of a few men served only to relieve and make more conspicuous the dark and impenetrable cloud of ignorance against which their efforts were utterly thrown away. This language is no doubt strong, but it is strictly true. It would, for example, have been difficult for any human being to compress within the same limited space a greater number of mistaken ideas than is contained in the following extract from Mr. Spaulding's speech of January 28th: —

"The bill before us is a war measure, a measure of necessity, not of choice. . . . . Congress may judge of the necessity in the present exigency. It may decide whether it will authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue demand treasury notes, and make them a legal tender in payment of debts, or whether it will put its 6 or 7 per cent bonds on the market, at ruinous rates of discount, and raise the money at any sacrifice the money-lenders may require, to meet the pressing demands upon the treasury. In the one case the government will be able to pay its debts at fair rates of interest; in the other, it must go into the streets *shinning* for the means, like an individual in failing circumstances, and sure of being used up in the end by the avarice of those who may exact unreasonable terms. But, sir, knowing the power of money, and the disposition there is among men to use it for the acquisition of greater gain, I am unwilling that this government, with all its immense power and resources, should be left in the hands of any class of men bankers, or money-lenders, however respectable or patriotic they may be. The government is much stronger than any of them. Its capital is much greater. It has control of all the bankers' money, and all the brokers' money, and all the property of the thirty millions of people under its jurisdiction. Why then should it go into Wall Street, State Street, Chestnut Street, or any other street, begging for money? Their money is not as secure as government money. All

the gold they possess would not carry on the government for ninety days. They issue only promises to pay, which, if Congress does its duty, are not half as secure as United States treasury notes based on adequate taxation of all the property of the country. *Why, then, go into the streets at all to borrow money?* I am opposed in our present extremities to all shifts of this kind. I prefer to assert the power and dignity of the government by the issue of its own notes."

He would be a bold man who should undertake to say that these remarks can, by any process of explanation, be made intelligible. Certainly Mr. Spaulding himself could not have understood them, for had he even begun to do so, he must have felt that they were absolute and unmitigated nonsense. The conclusion, however, is clear enough, and is well worth attention. Had Mr. Spaulding's studies ever led him to read Goethe's Faust, he might at this point have recalled the scene where Mephistopheles, in the character of court-jester, invents for the empire a legal-tender currency based on the firm foundation of old treasures which in past ages might have been hidden underground, and applauds his own creation as better than coin, because, if the bankers refused to give coin for it, the holder would at worst have only the trouble of digging. The great satirist, however, with all his genius, was not so great a satirist as Mr. Spaulding. He never thought of carrying the bitterness of his sarcasm so far as to invoke the *dignity* of the empire as the chief glory of his paper money, and yet Mephistopheles closes his scene with the exulting exclamation: —

"Wer zweifelt noch an unsers Narren Witz!"

Yet one thing remains to be said before quitting Mr. Spaulding. If he really had an idea in his own mind, and sincerely believed that the government need not go into the streets at all to borrow money, and that a simple assertion of its own dignity would place it in command of indefinite resources; in other words, if he thought that the dignity of the government forbade its borrowing, except on its own terms, and that there was no necessity for it to borrow at all, it is a matter of grave question how he can justify himself in having consented that the government should pay 6 per cent or even 1 per cent for money, or should promise to repay any money whatever.

The argument of Mr. Hooper was less extravagant. He avoided committing himself to anything except to a cautious opinion that the paper issue would make the government financially more independent, and that if Mr. Chase were discreet, the quality of legal tender would help him to keep the notes at par. The latter opinion may, perhaps, be questioned, and indeed Mr. Chase has himself questioned it in his late judgment, but at least it was not absurd.

Mr. Bingham, however, rivalled Mr. Spaulding, though in a different way. His speech was necessarily made without reference to financial principles, since Mr. Bingham made no pretence to the slightest acquaintance with that subject. He therefore assumed at the outset that the bill was necessary, because it was said to be necessary, and he then burst into a brilliant denunciation of all persons who refused to believe in the necessity. Mr. Roscoe Conkling was the victim first immolated.

"Sir," said Mr. Bingham, "as a representative of the people I cannot keep silent when I see efforts made upon this side of the house and upon that, to lay the power of the American people to control the currency at the feet of brokers and of city bankers, who have not a tittle of authority, save by the assent or forbearance of the people, to deal in their paper issued as money. I am here to-day to assert the rightful authority of the American people as a nationality, sovereignty, under and by virtue of their Constitution."

Such legal finance would not call for notice, except that it came from a leader in Congress, who, in order to protect the sovereignty of the American people from bankers and brokers, insisted upon creating a legal-tender paper currency, which has always been and always will be the most efficient instrument ever yet discovered for the worst purposes of this very class of men. Yet Mr. Bingham denounced his opponents for acting with the purpose of sacrificing the public interest to the interest of bankers and brokers. At the same time it is mortifying to observe the ignorance and vulgar prejudice with which the bankers and brokers of the country were always mentioned in these debates. Perhaps no other single characteristic offers so much instruction as this simple fact, in regard to the temper and the range of thought exhibited in this momentous discussion. Mr. Bingham's remarks have already

been quoted. Mr. Stevens, with his usual nice discrimination, characterized the dealers in money as "sharks and brokers," to which he afterwards added "harpies." Mr. Shellabarger, after appropriating bodily and almost literally several pages of Macaulay's most luminous and most familiar writing, in the effort to maintain himself on Macaulay's level without Macaulay's aid, could discover no more original idea for his peroration than to denounce the outside opposition to this bill as coming from interested persons in the expectation "that out of the blood of their sinking country they may be enabled to coin the gains of their infamy." Senator Wilson announced that the practical question lay between "brokers and jobbers and money-changers on the one side, and the people of the United States on the other." Invective like this properly belongs only to a debating-club of boys. But if invective were to be used at all, and if these bankers had been represented in Congress by any person capable of using it, he might easily have retaliated in a manner which would have left little opportunity for an effective rejoinder. He might have replied that men who claim to be trusted for all they say in regard to a financial exigency; who assert in one breath that a necessity exists, which in the next breath they acknowledge does not exist; who presume on this utterly unwarrantable plea of necessity to exculpate themselves from what, without exculpation, is the wickedest vote the representative of the people can ever give; a vote which delivers labor to the mercy of capital; a vote which forces upon the people that as money which in no just sense is money; a vote which establishes as law one of the most abominable frauds which law can ever be prostituted to enforce;—that such men are not the persons to judge of others' patriotism, honesty, or good sense.

And here it may be proper to add a remark as to the disposition of Congress to stumble over constitutional difficulties. A very large part of the debate turned on the point of technical construction of the Constitution; and many members of the legislature who hesitated about nothing else found an insurmountable obstacle here. The constitutional argument, whatever its weight may be, is one on which only lawyers will be likely to insist. Whether under a strict interpretation of con-

stitutional powers, the law of legal tender is to be justified or not, can make but little difference to persons who look for their principles of action beneath the letter of the Constitution, to the principles upon which all government and all society must ultimately rest. The law of legal tender was an attempt by artificial legislation to make something true which was false. This is the sum-total of the argument against legal tender, and this argument is based on the eternal maxim that the foundation of law is truth. If it is possible for the rhetoric of congressional orators or the ingenuity of professional lawyers to reduce the principle involved to simpler elements than this, at all events neither the debates at the Capitol nor the arguments at the bar, however brilliant or elaborate they may have been, have as yet shown any probability of success.

It would be pleasant to extract from the speeches delivered in favor of this bill any such portions as show depth of knowledge, elevation of morals, or breadth of mind. Unfortunately nothing of the sort exists. Almost all the soundest minds in the House declared themselves against legal tender and denied its necessity. Judge Thomas of Massachusetts and Mr. Roscoe Conkling of New York, Mr. Morrill of Vermont, from the Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Horton of Ohio, also of the Ways and Means, all the Democratic members, and others who contented themselves with a silent vote, opposed the legal-tender clause. And by some freak of nature, which seems occasionally to amuse itself with putting into the mouths of extreme and violent men language and argument which express the most elevated sense of fitness, the speech of Mr. Owen Lovejoy of Illinois was in its short space as clear, as vigorous, and, from a rhetorical point of view, as perfect, as the oldest statesman or the most exacting critic or the deepest student of finance could have hoped or wished to make. But although the opponents of the measure were far superior in intellect to its supporters, and although their arguments were essentially sound, and under ordinary circumstances would probably have proved successful, they could not deal with the authority of the executive, which Mr. Chase now used with all his energy in favor of the bill. On the 6th of February Mr. Spaulding pressed his measure to a vote, and it passed the House by a majority of 93 to 59.

One can scarcely resist the conclusion that, had the bill originated in the Senate, and been discussed without the prejudice arising from the responsibility of rejecting what was approved by the House and urged by the Executive, and had it been acted upon before so much valuable time had been lost, the country would probably for the time have been spared the great misfortune of its adoption. This opinion is rendered probable by the higher and more statesmanlike spirit in which the Senate discussed the proposed measure. If it were possible that a mere word of unqualified admiration could please the ear or help to soothe the rest of a statesman whose loss the nation has regretted but has never fairly appreciated, there would be a keen and personal pleasure in repeating the language of Mr. Fessenden, who reported this bill to the Senate: —

"The question after all returns: is this measure absolutely indispensable to procure means? If so, as I said before, necessity knows no law. What are the objections to it? I will state them as briefly as I can. The first is a negative objection. A measure of this kind certainly cannot increase confidence in the ability or integrity of the country. . . . .

"Next, in my judgment, it is a confession of bankruptcy. . . . .

"Again, say what you will, nobody can deny that it is bad faith . . . . and encourages bad morality both in public and private. . . . .

"Again, it encourages bad morals, because if the currency falls (*as it is supposed it must, else why defend it by a legal enactment*), what is the result? It is that every man who desires to pay off his debts at a discount, no matter what the circumstances are, is able to avail himself of it against the will of his neighbor who honestly contracted to receive something better.

"Again, sir, necessarily as a result, in my judgment, it must inflict a stain upon the national honor. . . . .

"Again, sir, it necessarily changes the value of all property. . . .

"Again, sir, a stronger objection than all that I have to this proposition is that the loss must fall most heavily upon the poor by reason of the inflation."

He concluded by declaring that in his opinion the legal-tender clause was not necessary, and he reported several amendments. One of these, the second, he described in these terms: "The committee . . . . give to the Secretary the power to sell the bonds of the government at any time that it may be

necessary, at the market price, in order to raise coin. *That can always be done.*" This amendment was ultimately adopted and became part of the bill, but the Secretary preferred reaching the same result by a different policy, and the old system was therefore retained.

But it was reserved for Mr. Collamer of Vermont to take yet stronger and more uncompromising ground. "Even if it was a *necessity*," said he, "I would not vote for this measure." Fidelity to a trust is not so universal that one might not be permitted to sympathize with a man who, when placed between the alternatives of utter destruction on the one hand and what he thinks a breach of trust on the other, in spite of necessity still maintains the standard of his personal honor. But there was in reality no such bravado in this declaration of Judge Collamer's. It was not mere impracticability that prompted his resistance, but a superior discernment that the evidence of necessity which imposes on a legislative body in times of panic is not to be trusted. Even on a calculation of chances, it is far more likely that other resources are available than that so desperate an expedient should offer the only hope of salvation. Nay, a measure which in itself is inherently and irredeemably wrong cannot in any just sense be a necessity. Mr. Collamer's speech, therefore, was only an energetic expression of his resolution, not that he would refuse to obey necessity, but that he would refuse to believe it.

The position taken by Mr. Sumner wanted only the same defiant confidence in the eternal laws of truth to have made it still more impressive than any of the others. Unhappily, by the side of Mr. Fessenden and Mr. Collamer, his conclusions seemed tinged with irresolution: —

"And now, as I close, I will not cease to be frank. Is it necessary to incur all the unquestionable evils of inconvertible paper, forced into circulation by act of Congress, — to suffer the stain upon our national faith, — to bear the stigma of a seeming repudiation, — to lose for the present that credit which in itself is a treasury, — and to teach debtors everywhere that contracts may be varied at the will of the stronger? Surely there is much in these inquiries which may make us pause. . . . . It is hard, very hard, to think that such a country, so powerful, so rich, and so beloved, should be compelled to adopt a policy of even ques-

tionable propriety. . . . . Surely we must all be against paper money, — we must all insist on maintaining the integrity of the government, — and we must all set our faces against any proposition like the present, except as a temporary expedient rendered imperative by the exigency of the hour. . . . . Others may doubt if the exigency is sufficiently imperative, *but the Secretary of the Treasury does not doubt.* . . . . Reluctantly, painfully, I consent that the process should issue."

The authority of the Secretary of the Treasury overruled the scruples of the Senate, and the bill passed by a majority of five votes on the legal-tender clause. It is scarcely worth while to carry the scene back to the House, in order to ascertain the fate of the Senate amendments, or to cull from the second debate new subjects for quotation. It is easy, only too easy, to ridicule and satirize the doctrines of men like Mr. Spaulding, and something like an apology to the public is due for the extent to which this appetite has been indulged in these pages. No such apology, however, is due to Mr. Spaulding himself. A man who can take pride in having originated the legal-tender law, and who can boast of his great share in carrying such a measure "over the administration and through Congress," is beyond the reach of criticism. Yet it is but just to add that Mr. Spaulding did strongly and invariably insist upon the difference between legal-tender notes that were fundable and the later issue of greenbacks which were not so. In point of fact, the difference was very slight. There was nothing in the condition of fundability which made legal tender anything but legal tender, nor would the principle of legal tender have been any sounder, even though it had been attached to the bonds themselves. The objection is that Mr. Spaulding perverted legislation into the instrument of fraud, and is proud of it. If, as he says, the fraud was necessary, or if, as others assert, the fraud was due to incapacity and ignorance, the question is only as to degree in shame. It is amusing to notice that as the later issues of legal tender were made, and the depreciation became excessive, Mr. Spaulding by similar steps became virtuous, until at last his virtue grew intense. He attributed the failure of his favorite financial scheme to the mistakes of others, and he proposed as an infallible cure a restoration of his funding proviso. There is little probability that Mr. Spaulding's mind

will ever succeed in gaining a higher stand-point than this, or will ever look over a wider horizon where it can more broadly measure the uncontrollable power of the elements which he, like the unlucky companions of Ulysses, ignorantly set free.

Such was the history of the legal-tender bill. So far as any evidence of its necessity can be drawn from the action of the Executive at the time, the late decision of Chief Justice Chase has left no doubt as to the facts. That Mr. Chase should, as Secretary of the Treasury, have adopted the course he did was doubly unfortunate: in the first place, because he created legal tender; and in the second place, because when the delusion was over, and his mind reverted to its first sound principles, the action he had taken as Secretary of the Treasury remained in the public memory to reduce the authority of the opinions he was bound to express as Chief Justice. Into the legal correctness or political propriety of these opinions it is no purpose of this essay to enter. No one who holds strong convictions against legal tender as a measure of finance is likely greatly to trouble his mind with the question whether such a power has or has not been conferred by the Constitution upon Congress. Though it were conferred in the most explicit terms language is capable of supplying, there could be no excuse on that account for changing an opinion as to its financial merits, and its financial merits are not a subject for lawyers, nor even for judges, as such, to decide. These happily rest on principles deeper than statute or than constitutional law. They appeal to no written code, and whenever the public attempts to overrule them, the public does so only at its own peril.

There remains but one more point to touch upon. The common impression undoubtedly is, that even though there were no actual necessity for a law of legal tender so early as February, 1862, yet at some subsequent time the enactment of such a law would have proved inevitable. This opinion should properly form the subject of a separate paper. If it be once acknowledged that the law of February, 1862, was unnecessary and passed by a practical fraud, the whole condition of the argument is changed. Whenever the public has reached this point, it will be time to enter upon the wider field of dis-

cussion into which so vague and general a proposition must lead. Yet, without venturing at present on any absolute denial of the theory, since this would require much explanation and reasoning, it is only fair to say that, although the subject is scarcely capable at present of positive demonstration, there is absolutely no evidence to prove that the government might not have carried the war to a successful conclusion without the issue of a single dollar of its legal-tender paper. Such appears to be the opinion of the Chief Justice, as it is undoubtedly the natural inference from economical principles.

It is, however, true that after the first issues of the paper, its original purpose and importance as a resource against a temporary exigency — that purpose which had alone influenced Mr. Spaulding, and which had been so discreditably used in forcing the bill through Congress — was almost wholly lost from sight, and the paper assumed entirely new functions as a financial instrument.

The government, adhering to the policy of selling its bonds only at par, was obliged to consider its paper as the par standard, and the next step was to issue of its own accord enough paper to "float" the successive loans. This was equivalent to selling its credit at the market price, with the addition of voluntarily degrading its own standard of value. In order to protect the nation's credit from degradation in the hands of bankers and brokers, the government undertook to dishonor it of its own free will. As a financial policy, this tortuous and disreputable expedient will not bear a moment's examination; but there was one incidental function of the paper, closely connected with this, on which more stress may be laid. The issue of paper money in large quantities does produce a temporary and feverish excitement, which, during a certain length of time, may facilitate borrowing, though at a frightful ultimate cost. If the sole object of the legal tender were to cause this temporary stimulus, and if this stimulus can be proved to have been essential to financial success, the management of the nation's financial affairs during the war may admit of excuse if not of praise. Unfortunately, neither of these conditions can be established.

This essay aims at no advocacy of any financial nostrum, nor at any cure of present difficulties. In the popular humor of the moment, it is more than ever doubtful whether any advice that is wise would be listened to, or whether any advice that has a chance of being listened to could possibly be wise. Mere knowledge has no hold upon political power in its treatment of this subject. Other considerations are supreme both in Congress and in the public mind. But although knowledge, and the application of simple truth in politics, are for the present divorced from power and no longer control the course of current events, yet at least the past belongs to them as their exclusive property, and no one can prevent the past from receiving, sooner or later, the judgment which historical criticism must inevitably exact for the betrayal of principles to which it pretended allegiance.

HENRY BROOKS ADAMS.

ART. V. — POVERTY AND PUBLIC CHARITY.

ALTHOUGH Gonzalo proposed to exclude both riches and poverty from Prospero's island, along with traffic, service, bound of land, tilth, vineyard, and the use of metal, neither he nor any other potentate has been able to carry out so generous a purpose. Riches and poverty have always coexisted, like heat and cold, motion and rest, and we have no reason to doubt that they always will. But the vice of riches and the evil of poverty are by no means so inseparable; and it is the part of every good ruler, the duty of every enlightened people, to see that these do not coexist, or that they are reduced to a minimum. One of the many appliances of civilization for preventing poverty from degenerating into occasional or permanent pauperism is public charity; and this, in some form or other, is as universal in all civilized countries as is the want which it seeks to relieve. It was certainly one of the strangest vagaries of the reasoning faculty which led Englishmen, in the early half of the present century, to deny that public charity

was a duty, or even an admissible interference with individual duties and the laws of political economy; yet so common was this view fifty years ago, that Edward Livingston, in the introduction to his Penal Code for Louisiana, felt called upon to stop and refute it. He pointed out, what everybody admits in practice, that every community owes a social duty to the individuals that compose it, and is bound to guarantee them their lives and property; that the obligation to protect life is greater than any other, since all the rest depend upon it; and that the prevention of death by poverty is as much a public duty as the repression of murder is. From this impregnable position he proceeded to develop his own ingenious and mainly correct system of the administration of public charity.

Livingston wrote nearly half a century ago (in 1821); yet of the hundreds who have treated the same topic since, scarcely one has advanced beyond the simple principles, laid down with anything but simplicity of language, which the Louisiana legislator proclaimed. But in practice there has been a great advance, particularly in America, where the difficulties of dealing with poverty have always been much less than in the Old World. My object in the present paper is to point out what has been done, and is now doing, in the United States, to lighten the task while extending the sphere of public charity. To make the matter plainer, I shall now and then resort to a comparison between the condition of the poor in Europe and the same class in America; and I shall also take the liberty of referring to a paper on the Poor-Laws of New England, published in this Review two years ago.

Up to the year 1820, when Edward Livingston and Josiah Quincy first began to attract notice as writers on the dependent and criminal classes in the United States, poverty had been the condition of the great majority of our people. A new country is seldom rich, except in opportunities and anticipations; and scarcely had the American Colonies, in the second century of their existence, begun to show that capacity for growth and material greatness which has now become the wonder of the world, than a succession of wars and financial calamities checked their progress for more than half a century. The French war, which ended in 1763, burdened heavily the

industry of the Colonies, and was immediately followed by the unfriendly action of the British government, culminating, a dozen years later, in the war of the Revolution. This, again, left the country impoverished and in debt; and no sooner did the genius of Hamilton and the youthful vigor of the new Republic free it from those burdens, than the trouble with France and England, resulting, finally, in the war of 1812, again checked the growth and embarrassed the finances of the United States. Before 1820 great fortunes were very rare among our people, while the mass of the farmers, mechanics, and laborers, North and South, were pinched and straitened to a degree that would now excite universal discontent, if those good old times should return. Whoever is familiar with the habits of life among the New England country people seventy or eighty years ago will understand what we mean by the common level of poverty among them. Their food, their dwellings, their garments, their advantages of education, their means of travel and amusement, were greatly inferior to what the same class of persons now enjoy. They had the advantage of their descendants chiefly in two things, — the bigness of their woodpiles and the cheapness of their liquor. They kept up great fires and they drank hard, but their drunkenness only increased the prevailing poverty, and smoothed the path to pauperism and crime. In proportion to their numbers, we have every reason to believe that pauperism was as prevalent from 1780 to 1820 as it has ever been since. At all events, we know, from the information collected by Josiah Quincy in 1820, that pauperism had greatly increased in Massachusetts in the twenty years preceding, and that it was proportionately a heavier burden on the people than it is now. The statistics given a dozen years later by the legislative commission, of which Rev. Dr. Tuckerman, W. B. Calhoun, and Henry Shaw were members, show the same state of things. Pauperism in Massachusetts in 1833 was a greater evil than it is now, and it was then increasing while now it is diminishing.*

Long before 1833, however, the practical task of checking

* The experience of Massachusetts in this matter is cited, because it has been more fully related in official documents than that of any other portion of the United States. The general facts, however, are the same all over the country.

the growth of pauperism, and the crime which springs from it, was undertaken in New York, in Massachusetts, and in Pennsylvania. While Livingston, a New York citizen removed to New Orleans, was setting forth his theory of the process, some of his old friends in New York were devising ways and means to put his theory in practice. Dr. John Griscom and Thomas Eddy, two New Jersey Quakers residing in New York, had, in 1817, organized in that city a "Society for the Prevention of Pauperism," which, in 1823, was transformed into a "Society for the Reformation of Juvenile Delinquents," and out of this last grew the New York House of Refuge, — the oldest of the public reformatories of America. Thomas Eddy was a correspondent of Livingston, and early became acquainted with his plan for the detention, employment, and reformation of the vicious poor, which is so fully set forth in his Louisiana Code. One part of this plan was a "School of Reform" for young delinquents, and this was adopted by Eddy and his associates. Their House of Refuge was modelled upon Livingston's ideas; and so was the Boston "House of Reformation," founded by Mayor Quincy in 1826, and the Philadelphia "House of Refuge," opened in 1827. These establishments may be considered as belonging either to the charitable or the penal system of the communities in which they exist, but they are supported from the public treasury for a charitable rather than a penal purpose, and are, in fact, one very important branch of the public charities of the three cities which still maintain them. And it is worth while to notice that reformatories of this kind were regarded by Livingston, by Quincy, and by the philanthropists of Philadelphia, as a part of a wide scheme of public charity and penal reform which was earnestly advocated throughout the United States from 1825 onward. The agitation thence resulting led to the introduction of the two conflicting systems of prison discipline, — that of Auburn and that of Philadelphia, — which, until the Irish Convict System came up in 1854, divided the suffrages of the prison reformers. Both these systems are inferior to that of Ireland, but both are a great advance on what preceded them, and have had some share in the diminution of pauperism and crime that has taken place within the last fifty years.

Josiah Quincy, however, applied himself more directly to the question of pauperism. In his report of 1821, already alluded to, he recommended "placing the whole subject of the poor in the Commonwealth under the regular and annual superintendence of the Legislature," thus anticipating, by more than forty years, the course that has finally been adopted by all the larger and more important States in the Union, and is likely to become the universal American policy. The creation of the Board of Charities in Massachusetts in 1863, in New York and Ohio in 1868, and in Pennsylvania, Illinois, Rhode Island, and North Carolina in 1869, is the modern interpretation of the recommendation made by Mr. Quincy to the Massachusetts Legislature half a century ago. The good results of this policy are already so manifest in the States that first began it, that it may be of service to point out what they have been and are likely to be hereafter. In doing so, I shall be compelled to refer frequently to what has taken place in Massachusetts within the last ten years; but the reader must believe that this is done in no vainglorious spirit, but simply because the facts mentioned are within the knowledge of the writer, and therefore can be confidently appealed to. There can be no doubt that the same action in other States would have been followed by results equally gratifying; while in many of the newer communities of the West much more could have been accomplished by the same effort. It was the fortune of Massachusetts to find herself with the care of a great army of dependants upon her hands; and the necessity of providing for them in the most economical way has led her into the measures which are now seen to be worthy of imitation elsewhere. No new discovery has been made, and no special merit is claimed for what has been done. Such a claim could not be sustained, were any one foolish enough to put it forward; for all that has been accomplished has been the consequence of heartily accepting and diligently acting upon maxims of common sense and common humanity, long familiar to the world.

The origin and general character of the poor-laws of New England were described in the North American Review for April, 1868, and some account was there given of the peculiar

pauper system of Massachusetts, under which nearly a third part of the public relief to poor persons had come to be a charge on the State treasury, ten years ago. The fact is also stated, that in 1868, under the operation of the old "settlement laws" of the State, more than half the resident population of Massachusetts had no local pauper settlement, and, if they fell into distress, had to be aided by the State rather than by the towns and cities. Here, then, as will at once be seen, was a field for applying on a large scale whatever wisdom had been handed down, or could be learned by experience, in regard to the treatment of the defective and dependent classes. A population of more than a million, averaging in density one hundred and fifty to the square mile, — which approaches the density of European populations,* — with a greater variety of employments and a more equal mixture of city, village, and rustic inhabitants than could be found elsewhere in America, was also so curiously circumstanced, in respect to laws and customs, that it presented nearly every problem found in the social experience of modern Europe, with this great exception, that democratic ideas prevailed, and had long prevailed, more fully here than almost anywhere else in the world. Moreover, the natural tendency of the Massachusetts people to philanthropy had led to the creation of almost every class of benevolent institutions, except the foundling hospital. We had asylums for the blind, the insane, the deaf-mute, the idiotic, the inebriate; schools for the young of these classes, for paupers, and for juvenile delinquents; prisons of three or four grades; hospitals for most maladies; almshouses, public and private; charitable societies of every kind; and a more careful classification of the objects of charity than existed anywhere else in America. We had two distinct systems of public relief for the poor: one administered by the State in half a dozen establishments, averaging hundreds of inmates; the other administered by three hundred and thirty cities and towns, in two hundred and twenty almshouses (averaging a dozen or fifteen inmates, but ranging all the way from the great Boston

* Ireland has now less than one hundred and eighty to the square mile, Scotland but little more than one hundred; Prussia has a few more, and Spain and Portugal less, than Massachusetts.

receptacle at Deer Island, with its hundreds, to the cottage of some hill town, with only an old couple for tenants, and an occasional vagrant who straggled along and begged a night's lodging), and in thousands of private families where the poor were supported or aided. Probably there could not have been found in the whole world a community better fitted for the application of the true principle of public relief, when discovered, or for discovering by experiment what that principle is.

It is now more than six years that this promising field in the great domain of social science — this "beautiful case" for moral and economical surgery — has been under the observation and in the hands of a body of men specially devoted to it, and in a reasonable degree qualified for their work. To what result their experience has led them can best be expressed in the words of the senior member of the Massachusetts Board of Charities, the distinguished philanthropist, Dr. Samuel G. Howe, in the Sixth Annual Report of the board: "Longer acquaintance with the condition of the dependants strengthens the belief that the existence of whole classes of defectives, of paupers, and of criminals is not among the essentials, but the accidents of a highly civilized state; and that the number and condition of those classes is largely under human control." * This statement is a more positive one than that made in the same spirit, in the Third Report, in 1867, where it was said: "The purpose of charity in New England has been to diminish the number of the helpless, to make them sounder, stronger, more hopeful and self-reliant. Justice, no less than mercy, has been in the thoughts of our people; a justice not satisfied with almsgiving, but seeking zealously to establish a social condition in which alms would be less and less needed. Painful as the sights of woe in many of our charitable institutions must be, they are made more tolerable by the thought that in America — the home of the poor man — we are in the way to throw off and neutralize much of the misery handed down to us from older countries and less hopeful times." †

* Sixth Annual Report, p. xix. Boston. 1870.

† Third Annual Report of the Massachusetts Board of State Charities, p. lix. Boston. 1867.

Before proceeding to examine the facts on which these hopes and assurances are founded, let us glance for a moment at the condition of the poor in Europe, and especially in England, the country whence Massachusetts draws her laws and customs, and to which she traces the ancestry of nine tenths of her people. Though we include in the England of which we now speak the whole United Kingdom, the most startling facts are found in the southern half of Great Britain. Twenty-five years ago it was otherwise. Then Ireland was the most impoverished part of the kingdom; but Ireland has been so far relieved by the deportation of its people as to be now in better condition, in respect to poverty, than England herself. Perhaps she was even in 1842, when Carlyle wrote his "Past and Present," and said, with sad humor: "Some two millions, it is now counted, sit in workhouses, poor-law prisons, or have 'outdoor relief' flung over the wall to them; the workhouse bastile being filled to bursting, and the strong poor-law broken asunder by a stronger. Twelve hundred thousand workers in England alone; they sit there pent up, as in a kind of horrid enchantment; glad to be imprisoned and enchanted, that they may not perish starved."* But during the Irish famine of 1846–47 the distress of the Irish poor reached a point never known in England, before or since; and the immediate result of it was an immense emigration from Ireland, not only to America, but to England and Scotland, countries which now contain thousands and perhaps hundreds of thousands of Irish paupers, just as the United States does. The population of Ireland, which in 1845 must have been nearly eight million five hundred thousand, has since fallen to but little more than five million five hundred thousand, and does not now exceed five million seven hundred and fifty thousand. Hence ensued a great decrease of pauperism and crime in Ireland; while across the Channel these evils have gone on increasing, and of late years faster than the growth in population or wealth. The number of public paupers relieved in London during the past winter rose in some weeks to one hundred and sixty thousand, besides

* Carlyle gives the return of paupers for England and Wales, at "Ladyday," 1842, as "indoor, 221,687; outdoor, 1,207,402; total, 1,429,089." But the cost of relief that year was only £ 4,911,498.

the great numbers relieved by private charity. The Daily News, remarking upon this state of things, a few months ago, said: "It may be assumed that, what between charity on the one hand and law on the other, poverty is not satisfactorily relieved; that misery, instead of diminishing, increases even faster than our wealth, and that it does so in spite of the unbounded benevolence which is bestowed upon the poor." Mr. Samuel Morley, a member of Parliament, in a speech delivered at a public meeting in London, January 26, said: "No one connected either with the manufacturing or general working population of the country could doubt the fact that at no period during the present century was there more prevalent distress than at this moment, — distress not confined to London, but pervading all the manufacturing and industrial districts; and not confined to England, for in all the manufacturing countries of the Continent there was almost an equal amount of distress." It is by no means certain that Mr. Morley is absolutely correct in this statement, but it is undeniable that the poverty of London and of all England has greatly increased since 1859. This increase, as shown by the poor-rates, has not been uniform, but it has been very considerable within the ten years just closed.

The state of affairs on the Continent of Europe, to which Mr. Morley referred, can hardly be described in a single sentence, so great is the diversity of circumstances in the different countries. But while in some countries pauperism has slightly diminished, in others it has largely augmented, and the general conclusion must be that, in spite of emigration and the improvement of laws and customs, it still presses as heavily as ever upon the mass of European peoples. In France, the present condition of the poor seems to be worse than for several years past; and one great source of apprehension to the government there, in its efforts to keep down the coming revolution, is the misery of the unemployed laborers in Paris and in the great manufacturing cities. In Spain pauperism increases under the military government that has succeeded to the ecclesiastical despotism of the Bourbons. In the rest of Europe there is some slight diminution of the distress of the poor, but it is slow and uncertain in most of the nations.

It has been asserted, indeed, that poverty is increasing in

the United States, that "the rich are growing richer and the poor poorer"; and the high authority of Commissioner Wells has been cited in support of this assertion. Undoubtedly the rich are growing richer in our country; that is a way they have everywhere in times of peace and prosperous trade. Very likely, too, certain classes of the laboring poor find it more difficult than formerly to subsist on their wages; partly because their standard of living has risen without regard to cost, and partly because of the high prices occasioned by the war, and its accompanying evils of heavy taxation and a fluctuating currency. But no evidence has yet appeared to prove that the great mass of our laboring population, agricultural as well as mechanical and manufacturing, are growing poorer, or even ceasing to grow richer. Statistics like those lately gathered by the assessors of the Internal Revenue Bureau, at the instance of Commissioner Wells, and soon to be made public by the Social Science Association and the Bureau of Statistics, ought to settle this much-disputed point. But until they do, the present writer will believe that the condition of the poor in the United States, on the whole, is better now than at any former period. His reason for thinking so, apart from lack of evidence to the contrary, is the fact that in those parts of the country where observations have been carefully made, though crime is greatly increased, pauperism has remained stationary, or has perceptibly diminished since the war began in 1861. And this brings us back to the cheerful declarations of the Massachusetts Board of Charities.

The confidence expressed in the possibility of reducing pauperism to a minimum, and keeping it there, is based, as we learn from the later reports of the board, upon carefully observed facts. In no state or city in America have the statistics of this subject been so accurately compiled as in Massachusetts. A register is kept at the State House on which is entered the name of every person receiving a dollar of public relief from the State, and another containing the names of every person fully supported by the towns and cities. Returns are also made yearly of the number who receive outdoor relief from the towns and cities, with such particulars as are necessary, and the names of all vagrants, except those in Boston,

are also returned. It is therefore possible to exclude most of the errors in pauper statistics arising from the frequent repetition of the same name, while it is also easy to see that all cases are reported. In most reports concerning pauperism the statistics of persons relieved are wholly unreliable, no pains being taken to exclude repetitions or secure fulness of return. Hence the wildness of the deductions sometimes made from them. But in Massachusetts, since 1864, the statistics, though not perfect, can be depended on more absolutely than any other such statements known to the present writer; and since 1854 they have been reasonably correct, so far as concerns the class of State paupers. By examining these figures, it appears that the number of paupers in Massachusetts has actually grown less in the last dozen years. This is a striking fact, of which the proof may as well be given here.

In the year 1858 the average number of poor persons supported in the 212 town and city almshouses in Massachusetts is reported as 3,254; in the four State almshouses, 2,769; total, 6,023. In 1869 the average number in 225 town and city almshouses was less than 3,000; in the State almshouses, 1,622; total, about 4,600, or a decrease in eleven years of more than 23 per cent, — nearly one fourth. The cost of supporting the 6,023 in 1858 was about $418,000 in gold; the cost of supporting the 4,600 in 1869 was, to be sure, nearly $500,000 in currency; but this, reduced to gold, would be but about $375,000; and when we consider the differences in prices between 1858 and 1869, it is probable that $325,000 in the former year would go as far towards supporting the poor as half a million dollars last year. However this may be, the decrease in the number supported seems to be certain. It is true that 1858 was a year specially noted for pauperism, in consequence of the great financial crisis of 1857, and that in 1859 the number of paupers fell from 6,023 to 5,250 in the town and State almshouses; but even that was an excess of 650 above the number reported ten years later. In 1860 the average number rose to 5,276; in 1861, in consequence of the first stress of the war, to 5,671; in 1862, to 5,800; but in 1863 the tide turned, and has been ebbing, with slight fluctuations, ever since. The number in

1863 was 5,295; in 1864, 4,804; in 1865, 4,983; in 1866, 4,827; in 1867, 4,677; in 1868, 4,795; and in 1869, as has been said, 4,600. Let it be remembered that from 1860 to 1865 the population increased but 36,000; while from 1865 to 1870 the increase has been at least 100,000, and the significance of these figures will be more perceptible.

Taking into account the poor of all kinds relieved at the public expense, and beginning with the year 1864, when the statistics were first gathered with substantial accuracy, we find the same general results, — a failure to increase, and even a positive diminution of the number receiving aid or support. If we look at the State paupers alone, upon whose condition the efforts of the Board of Charities have been mainly directed, we find this diminution very marked, especially within the past three or four years, since the policy of the board has had its full effect. The average number of State paupers supported in public establishments was 2,537 in 1860; 2,911 in 1861; 3,156 in 1862; 2,750 in 1863; 2,527 in 1864; 2,591 in 1865; 2,399 in 1866; 2,259 in 1867; 2,309 in 1868; and only 2,108 in 1869. If to these numbers are added the probable average numbers of the sick State poor supported in the towns in 1865 and succeeding years, the average for 1865 would become 2,650; for 1866, 2,550; for 1867, 2,400; for 1868, 2,550; and for 1869, 2,310. These figures show a decrease of 340 in four years, — more than twelve per cent, — though the population of the State in the mean time had increased at least eight per cent. A portion of the decrease in State paupers was due to changes in the laws of settlement, which threw a larger number on the towns for support; yet in the four years since 1865 the average number of town paupers fully supported increased but about one hundred, while the number receiving outdoor relief has fallen off more than thirteen per cent; being 27,136 in 1865, and only 23,392 in 1869. What makes this last-mentioned decrease more noticeable is the fact that the State pensions to disabled soldiers and the families of those killed in the war have fallen off more than one half since 1865; for it was supposed by many that, with the cessation of these pensions, or "State aid," pauperism in the towns and cities would at once largely increase. Such has not been the effect, nor does it seem likely to be so hereafter.

It will be maintained, of course, that one great reason why pauperism has not increased in Massachusetts, since the war, is the payment to soldiers and other families of the pension just mentioned, which, in the five years since the war ended, has amounted to between five and six million of dollars, or an average of more than a million a year. Undoubtedly this has had some effect; but how little may be seen from the fact that while the payments for this purpose in 1865–66 were at least $1,500,000, and for 1869 only half that sum, the cessation of payments amounting to three quarters of a million of dollars a year has not prevented a considerable diminution in the number of public paupers relieved from the ordinary poor-rates. The truth seems to be that the "State aid" is a part of the war expenditure of Massachusetts, which her people have paid because it was justly due to disabled soldiers and their families; while this and the other and heavier expenses of the war have produced actually no effect in the way of increasing poverty, which has not been offset by the payments themselves. That is to say, the poverty occasioned by the war has been relieved by the stimulus which the war gave to industry everywhere, and the people have been able to endure extraordinary taxation for war purposes, without approaching any nearer the slough of pauperism than they were ten years ago. On the contrary, these ten years have developed such resources and methods for checking pauperism and improving the general condition of the poor, that Massachusetts, at least, is really better off in this respect than she was in 1860. And, so far as we know, this is true of the other Northern States, and probably of the whole country.

The coming census of the United States, which is to be taken under the direction of an accomplished statistician, Mr. Francis A. Walker, ought to show conclusively what are the facts in this matter. But in the mean time we must make use of such partial statistics as can be found, and these give the same result in other States that we have noticed in Massachusetts. In Ohio, where the returns of pauperism are manifestly defective, their general purport is doubtless accurate, and from this it is clear that the number of paupers is but little, if any, greater than before the war. The population of the State has largely increased; yet while 5,511 paupers were reported in 1863, and

6,037 in 1866, the number for 1869 is but 5,837. In the city of New York, the great focus of all the pauperism of the country, although the cost of relieving the poor has augmented, their number has scarcely increased at all since ten years ago. The great "New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor," one of the most active private charities in the world, relieved 15,549 families in 1855; 13,842 in 1858; 8,031 in 1860; 8,532 in 1861; 8,197 in 1868; and only 6,269 in 1869. The whole number of persons relieved by its agents in 1860 was 35,942; in 1869, only 22,963. The Children's Aid Society, established and supervised for the last seventeen years by that judicious philanthropist, Mr. Charles L. Brace, although it has gone on adding to its work constantly, because it has not yet covered the whole immense field of activity in a city like New York, reports this year that it has succeeded in diminishing juvenile vagrancy and crime, — one of the chief feeders of pauperism. In 1862 there were 4,299 commitments of children for vagrancy in New York; in 1869, 2,071, or less than half as many. The total arrests of minors were but 12,075 in 1869, against 11,357 in 1863, though the city population has greatly increased; while the arrests of girls, which in 1862 were 2,885, were only 2,397 in 1869. The city Board of Public Charities and Correction and the Commissioners of Emigration have indeed added much to their establishments for the insane, the inebriate, and the vicious poor, since 1860, and they have under their charge a somewhat larger number of all classes; but they do not report that simple pauperism has kept pace with the movement of population. Indeed, the first-named board, in its Report for 1869, states that there are fewer inmates of the city almshouses than there were twenty years ago. On the 1st of January, 1850, New York City had 1,313 almshouse inmates; at the same date in 1860, 1,631; and on the 1st of January, 1870, only 1,114. The Commissioners add: "The instances of want among the able-bodied are few, and generally traceable to dissipation or loss of character, or they are widows struggling to rear families of children." The number of persons receiving public outdoor relief in New York on the 1st of February, 1869, was 10,616; on the 1st of August, 1869, 2,656; and on the 1st of January, 1870, 8,017.

The whole number of persons receiving public relief at the last-named date in New York City did not exceed 20,000, in a population of a million; while in London, with a population but little more than thrice as great, there were nearly eight times as many public paupers, — between 150,000 and 160,000. Yet New York is more infected with pauperism than any other portion of our country, from the necessity of its position. The number receiving public relief in Massachusetts at the same date, with a population of 1,400,000, was probably less than 17,000.*

It is to be observed, further, that while there has been no relative increase of pauperism in the United States, proportionate to the advance in population and wealth, the absolute increase, where there has been any, is wholly in the foreign population. In Massachusetts, the number of paupers of American parentage is very much less than it was a generation ago. Probably two thirds of the money now expended for public charity in that State goes to persons who were either born in foreign countries or are the children of foreigners. That there has been a considerable diminution of native pauperism, absolute and not relative, may be seen by the example of a single town, which has an experience similar to that of most of the country villages in Massachusetts. Concord, in 1832, had a population of just about two thousand, and among them, probably, there were not fifty foreigners. At the present time it has about two thousand two hundred and fifty inhabitants, of whom at least five hundred are either foreign born or of foreign parentage, chiefly Irish. The number of paupers was greater in Concord in 1832, as shown by Mr. Calhoun's report, than it is now; yet half of the present pauperism is among those who have come into the town since 1832; so that the 1,950 native-born inhabitants in that year must have furnished twice as many paupers as the 1,750 natives did in 1869. In other words, pauperism among the people of old New England stock in this town has decreased nearly or quite

* As a further indication of the decrease of the number of State paupers in Massachusetts, it may be mentioned that the number supported in the State almshouses and lunatic hospitals, January 1, 1867, was 2,355; January 1, 1868, 2,495; January 1, 1869, 2,297; January 1, 1870, 1,978. This number rose February 19 to 2,070.

one half since 1832. All over New England the same fact is to be noted, though the improvement in the condition of the native-born inhabitants is not always so conspicuous as in this instance. Of the 17,000 estimated as receiving public charity in Massachusetts at the beginning of this year, certainly 10,000, and probably 12,000, were either foreigners or their children; and of the 20,000 estimated as receiving public charity in the city of New York, at least 15,000 belonged to the same class. And it must not be forgotten that our people are compelled to contend, not only against our natural and native-born pauperism, but against constant and formidable invasions of the pauperized inhabitants of Europe. In spite of this, and in spite of all the financial derangement, drain of resources, loss of life and health, and destruction of property occasioned by our civil war, I have no doubt that the condition of our poor, the country through, is as good now as it was in 1860, and, in many localities, a great deal better.

There are, unquestionably, some facts that make against this conclusion. The Bureau of Labor in Massachusetts has collected and published statistics this year tending to show that the skilled laborers of the State are not so well off as formerly, and that the homes of the lowest poor in Boston, as in New York, are unfit for human beings to live in, and are growing worse from year to year. Without calling in question these statements, which are the result of careful investigation by General Oliver and his deputy, it is enough to say that they relate to but a small fraction of the workingmen and workingwomen of the State, whole classes of whom are known to be improving their homes and fortunes; and that the statistics of pauperism, already cited, show that the demoralization of industry and the distress of the industrious classes cannot have gone very far, if it does not manifest itself in the records of public charity. The almshouse register is an excellent measure of the fortunes of labor. When labor prospers, the register falls off; a slight reverse in trade or industry adds to its numbers; a great financial crisis, like that of 1857, almost doubles them. Even the natural cessation of business in the winter months has almost as much to do with the filling up of the almshouse between Thanksgiving and Fast-day as the

severity of our climate has. Whoever observes the fluctuations in public charity, from month to month and from year to year, has his finger on the pulse of industry.

Having shown, or at least asserted, that public charity has done something in this country, and particularly in Massachusetts, to control the evils which, in European countries, seem capable only of slight alleviations, and to reduce the number of the dependent classes to a minimum, let us now see more precisely how it has been done. American philanthropists have first classified, then educated, and finally protected these dependants, and at each step in the process the number of the self-supporting has been increased. To separate the young from the old, the vicious from the honest poor, the invalid and insane from the able-bodied and the sane, was the first step; and this classification, once made, releases many from a condition of absolute dependence, and puts them in the way of self-support. The children cease then to be paupers, and become pupils in some school, or find places in families, where they gradually rise to a condition of independence; the sick and the insane are more rapidly restored to health; and the vicious, placed under wholesome restraint, are compelled to earn part of their own subsistence. Next to classification comes instruction; and here it is that the American system has been particularly efficacious. In schools for the blind, for the deaf-mute, for the idiot, we have trained those classes, elsewhere so dependent, to a very satisfactory degree of independence; in orphan asylums and reformatories and industrial schools we have educated the neglected and vicious among the young, so that thousands of that class have become respectable members of society; and this work has been undertaken by the public, and paid for from the public treasury, in the United States, to an extent elsewhere unknown. Finally, we are now undertaking the supervision and protection of the dependent classes in ways hitherto unpractised, and with results in the highest degree gratifying. From the days of Edward Livingston and Josiah Quincy to the present time this threefold work has gone on, now faster, now slower, and in very different ways in different parts of the country. Of late years it has been more actively prosecuted, and in certain States

assumes the form of a complete and co-ordinated system. In some of the larger cities also, notably in New York and Boston, the same thing has been done under municipal or State authority.

Each in its own sphere excelling the other, the New York City Board of Charities and Correction, and the Massachusetts Board of State Charities, take the lead in the systematic extension of public charity, and the publication of information respecting it. The New York Board (which must not be confounded with the New York State Board of Charities, of more recent establishment) was created in 1860, to replace the "Ten Governors" of the city almshouse. It has absolute control of the public charities of the city, and of some of the city prisons, — appointing all officers, and regulating all expenses, as well as directing the general policy pursued. The establishments under its charge are numerous and varied, and have been much increased of late years; they contain an average population of some 8,000 persons, — more than the whole number of paupers, pupils, and reform-school inmates supported by the State and the municipalities of Massachusetts. Its hospitals for disease far excel those of Massachusetts in number and variety; the provision for foundling children is also very extensive, and the economical details of the board's administration are generally admirable. Within the last few years it has enlisted the aid of some of the best medical talent in the country, and its reports manifest a constant improvement from year to year in their whole charitable system. It has nothing to do, however, with the great task of supervising the alien passengers arriving at New York, which is left to the Commissioners of Emigration, — another board that does good service in its field of labor. The Massachusetts Board of Charities, organized in 1863, has a more general work to do, with less control of persons and of the details of business. It performs for the State of Massachusetts the same function, so far as general powers are concerned, that the Commissioners of Emigration and the city Board of Charities perform for New York City; but it has no power to appoint officers or control expenditure in the State establishments under its supervision. It has, however, many administrative duties in the complicated relations existing be-

tween the State and its towns and cities, and a comprehensive power of investigation and recommendation which has brought its work very prominently before the public; for which reason its reports have received attention throughout the country. Other States have followed the example of Massachusetts in creating such boards, but none of these possess such a wide range of powers, and few have yet been in existence long enough to accomplish much. Ten years hence the accumulated information gained by all these organizations will be of inestimable value to the community.

The Massachusetts board, during the six years and a half of its existence, has signalized itself by a great change in the method of deaf-mute education, which is already accomplished in that State, and is fast gaining ground elsewhere. Under its suggestions, aided by private benevolence, State legislation, and city ordinances, two schools for teaching deaf-mutes by articulation have been established, — the Clarke Institution at Northampton, endowed by the generous citizen whose name it bears with a fund of $250,000, and recognized by Massachusetts and some other States as entitled to receive pupils at the public expense; and the city school in Boston, opened last autumn under the direction of the school committee, and supported from the common-school appropriation of the city. These two schools now contain more than seventy deaf-mute pupils, most of them admitted at an age younger than the Hartford Asylum chooses to receive them; at the same time the number at Hartford is undiminished; so that the result of the board's agitation of this subject has been the addition of fifty per cent to the children of this class in Massachusetts receiving instruction. The board has also done something to promote a much-needed reform in prison discipline, which now begins to show some practical fruits in the better instruction and employment of prisoners, and their protection after discharge.

Coming to the more special business of the board, we may find a summary of what it has accomplished and what it aims to do in its lately published report: * —

"It has lessened the number of the sick at the almshouses, by pro-

* Sixth Annual Report, p. xxxvii.

viding for their relief at their homes. It has prevented the establishment of a new State Lunatic Hospital, by causing the temporary removal of the harmless and supposed incurable insane to Tewksbury, whence they are distributed as fast as possible. It has caused the establishment of the State Primary School (removing from its pupils by statute the stigma of pauperism), to which the children are gathered, and, as speedily as may be, diffused in society by being placed in suitable families. It has secured the creation of a State Workhouse, eliminating thus the vicious element from the other institutions; and also of the 'visiting agency' of the State to intercept children from commitment to public institutions, and to place them at once under the influences of a proper home. It has also secured a liberal extension of the 'laws of settlement,' thereby obtaining local rights for thousands heretofore unsettled; and it has inaugurated measures, which are just going into operation, for the better protection of the State from foreign defectives, and dependants from abroad, and for driving tramps and vagrants from its limits.

"The board deems it a duty to protest against any increase of the large public institutions of the State; to call for the abolition of some existing ones; to labor for the further reduction of the number and the population of those which must be continued; to plead for a hospital delivery of many harmless lunatics; for their release from restraint, and restoration to such liberty as they may safely enjoy, and their location in ordinary households; and to advocate the local support of the poor, within the cities and towns where they reside, the State reimbursing the cost of aiding and removing the unsettled, and exercising a vigilant supervision over this class."

This policy, as will be seen, is one of thorough classification, and of diffusion among the people, as far as possible, of the exceptional classes with which public charity is compelled to deal. All the measures of the board tend in this direction, while at the same time it advocates and in part exercises a strict visitation and supervision, in behalf of the State, of the children and poor persons who are thus distributed among the general population, instead of being cooped up in great public establishments. The best examples of this supervision now existing are found in the Visiting Agency to look after poor children placed in families by the State authorities, and the visitation of the sick State poor who are cared for by the town authorities. The former is a new office, and is not known to exist anywhere else; it is, however, one of the most necessary and

useful instrumentalities for diminishing pauperism and promoting the comfort and education of orphan children. This agent finds places in suitable families for the three or four hundred children annually thrown upon the care of the State, and he also visits those who have formerly been placed in families. He ascertains their condition and conduct, hears the complaints on both sides, redresses grievances, secures schooling and good treatment for the children, and transfers to the proper establishment or to another family those who should be removed. The immediate effect of this agency has been to double the number of children annually sent into families from the pauper establishments and the reformatories, and thus to reduce considerably the number maintained in public institutions. The Visiting Agency began in a small way in 1866, but did not have much effect on the number of children in the State establishments until 1868. On the 1st of October, 1867, these children numbered 1,476 ; at the same time in 1868, only 1,363 ; and in 1869 they did not exceed 1,150. The whole number visited in their places by the different agents exceeds a thousand, and the location and circumstances of as many more have been ascertained. The visitations of the sick State poor have been as numerous, and their comfort has been much better provided for than under the practice of sending them indiscriminately to almshouses. It is by such active supervision as this, extended to every class of the recipients of public charity, by State and local authorities, that the sources of pauperism can be dried up, and the natural substitutes for poor-law relief can be found and brought into activity. The charity of kindred, of the wealthy and childless, of those benevolent persons who are ever ready to administer aid that is more kindly and efficacious than public alms, — these, and many more agencies for the alleviation of poverty before it reaches the ugly crisis of pauperism, are called into action by the system of distribution and supervision adopted of late years in Massachusetts.

In New York and Ohio, where State Boards of Charities have existed for two or three years, their attention has been specially directed to the condition of the poor, particularly lunatics, idiotic and epileptic persons, and young children, in the county almshouses of those States. Little has been done as yet, how-

ever, except to direct public attention to the evils pointed out. The Ohio board this year recommend State asylums for the chronic insane, for idiotic and epileptic persons, county homes for the poor children, district workhouses for vagrants and petty criminals, and the adoption of the Irish convict system, wherever practicable. These recommendations, along with much valuable information, appear in the third Ohio Report, just published. The New York State board has issued but one report, which is a volume of considerable statistical value. Its Report for 1869 will not appear for some months, and will be largely devoted to the charities, public and private, of the city of New York. The Rhode Island board, appointed in June, 1869, has a task more nearly resembling that of the Massachusetts board, and is following the same line of action. Its first Report was published in February, and, though brief, is valuable. The Illinois board, also appointed last summer, has a Report in preparation, similar in character to that of the Ohio board, but fuller and more general. The Pennsylvania board has lately organized, and will not report until next winter.*

All these organizations exist for the purpose of regulating and improving the administration of public charity, and they will do an immense service to the American people, if properly seconded and sustained. Co-operating with thousands of local officers, and with the general tendency of American ideas and institutions, they will labor to reduce pauperism to its lowest terms, to ameliorate the condition of all the dependent and defective classes, and to prevent the formation or continuance of that permanent caste of the poor and vicious which is the curse of European civilization. The experience of Massachusetts shows that this is possible to a great extent, and the experience of other States, ten years hence, will undoubtedly enlarge and deepen our knowledge of the best way to accomplish it. In the midst of the activities, generous or base, and the distracting turmoil of American life, it is cheering to find

* The secretaries of these boards, on whom the preparation of the Reports chiefly depends, are, in Massachusetts, Edward L. Pierce; in Rhode Island, Dr. Edwin M. Snow; in New York, Dr. Charles H. Hoyt; in Pennsylvania, Wilmer Worthington; in Ohio, Rev. A. G. Byers; in Illinois, Rev. F. H. Wines. Dr. S. G. Howe has been for five years chairman of the Massachusetts board, and Prof. T. W. Dwight is an active member of the New York State board.

that we are really making progress in this direction; that we have not only abolished slavery and the political distinctions founded thereon, but are steadily advancing towards emancipation from the most hideous forms and consequences of the pauperism that everywhere replaces slavery when first abolished.

F. B. Sanborn.

Art. VI. — *The History of the Norman Conquest of England, its Causes and its Results.* By Edward A. Freeman, M. A., late Fellow of Trinity College. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 8vo.

Vol. I. *The Preliminary History to the Election of Edward the Confessor.* pp. 650. 1867.

Vol. II. *The Reign of Edward the Confessor.* pp. 651. 1868.

Vol. III. *The Reign of Harold and the Interregnum.* pp. 768. 1869.

Mr. E. A. Freeman has abandoned for a while the work in which he won his first laurels, has left unfinished his History of Federal Government, and commenced a history of the conquest of England by the Normans, three volumes of which are now before the public. This change in his field of labor is only temporary, he assures us; indeed, it would not be strange if the studies which have interrupted his first enterprise, were after all preparatory to its continuation. When he had completed his view of federalism in ancient times, and came to the discussion of modern federal institutions, he found the feudal system demanding primary attention; and a comparative view of the Teutonic and Romance nations, with the elements that they respectively contributed to feudalism, would find its most remarkable and instructive moment in that great event which of a sudden brought a fully developed Germanic nation within the range of imperial and feudal ideas. However this may be, we meet with more than one intimation that our author, as he proceeds with his present task, is gathering and collating materials for the one which has been temporarily sus-

pended; and the wide range of studies requisite for that work gives many an acceptable illustration or argument to this.

The three volumes already published bring the history down to the coronation of William I. at Westminster, on Christmas day, 1066. We are promised two more volumes, which are to treat of the immediate and the more distant results of the conquest; one, that is, to contain the reign of William, and the other to trace the history in a general way down to the time of Edward I. These two volumes will thus correspond to the two introductory volumes, of which the first gives a general sketch of English history down to the accession of Edward the Confessor, while the second is devoted to the reign of this king, and the third treats solely of the events of the year 1066, together with the affairs of Normandy which bear directly upon them. Thus the book is in reality a history of England from early times; the earliest period treated cursorily indeed, but with such freshness, vigor, and perspicuity that it may fully take the place of a much more detailed work. Of all Mr. Freeman's high qualities as an historian, — and they are many, — we are most impressed by his power of giving life to the times of which he treats. He grasps the essential points, those which will tell most strongly upon the mind of a reader of the nineteenth century; and in especial gives us a view of international life and relations which is of the highest value. In these three volumes we find the civil and ecclesiastical history of England and of Normandy admirably given; and wherever a contemporaneous event will throw light upon his subject, it is made to do service.

In his chapter upon the ancient English constitution Mr. Freeman disclaims all credit for originality, such as he believes he is entitled to in the narrative part of the history. Nevertheless, we cannot but think that even if his views of the constitution itself are learned from Mr. Kemble and Sir Francis Palgrave, he yet deserves the credit for what has been to us the most striking and instructive feature of the book, what we may call its *comparative* character, its treatment of early English institutions in the light of those of other Teutonic nations, and of even more distant kindred. "The early history of the Teuton," he says (Vol. I. p. 76), "is con-

stantly illustrated by the early history of his Aryan kinsmen, and the living picture of the old Achaians of Homer brings vividly before us many an institution of our own forefathers and many an incident of their early history."

In these contributions to what has been termed Comparative Jurisprudence, — a younger and as yet scarcely recognized sister of Comparative Philology, — Mr. Freeman has done good service to his readers. Even if the views themselves are not new, they are so combined and so put as to have all the freshness of novelty; and it is this class of inquiries which is now leading every year to richer results, as the studies of historians are directed to points of a more and more fundamental nature. Mr. Maine says of the historians of former generations, that, "when they turned their attention to archaic states of society which exhibited much superficial difference from their own, they uniformly ceased to observe and began guessing. The mistake which they committed is therefore analogous to the error of one who, in investigating the laws of the material universe, should commence by contemplating the existing physical world as a whole, instead of beginning with the particles which are its simplest ingredients." * Historians of the present day, following the lead of the philologists, have begun to study society and institutions at the foundation, by analyzing and comparing the varied elements of primeval times, together with the forms which they assume in early history; and in this work Mr. Freeman is a diligent and successful laborer.

We are yet far from possessing the data for a complete comparison of primeval institutions, and we are in danger of taking chance resemblances or analogies arising from a similarity of circumstances as evidence of an identity of origin. The inquirer is puzzled by the variety of form which the same primitive institutions may assume in different communities; baffled, too, by the impossibility of determining in all cases when two nations widely separated in time and space may be considered as standing at the same point of development. Thus, in regard to the Romans, whose early institutions are better known than those of almost any nation, Mommsen shows that, in legal institutions and customs, "fewer traces comparatively of the

* Ancient Law, p. 115.

primitive state of things have been preserved in the case of the Italians, and of the Romans in particular, than in the case of any other Indo-Germanic race. . . . . In this respect, Italian history begins at a far later stage of civilization than e. g. the Greek or the Germanic, and from the first it exhibits a comparatively modern character." * But while Roman society in general possesses this comparatively modern character, its political institutions, on the other hand, preserve features of the primitive patriarchal system in a higher degree and for a longer time than either the Greek or the Germanic ; so that while from one point of view Roman civilization is modern in character, in another it retains elements of the greatest antiquity. For this reason, as well as because of the greater certainty and fulness of Roman tradition, the same author pronounces early Roman society to be the best point of departure for the study of comparative jurisprudence.

It is, indeed, chiefly from the examination of Roman and Indian antiquities that Mr. Maine has shown the patriarchal order of society to be the primitive one, so far back, at least, as we can trace the history of law. "The history of political ideas begins with the assumption that kinship in blood is the sole possible ground of community in political functions ; nor is there any of those subversions of feeling which we term emphatically revolutions, so startling and so complete as the change which is accomplished when some other principle — such as that, for instance, of local contiguity — establishes itself for the first time as the basis of common political action." † Now the Roman commonwealth underwent this revolution in historical times, when the plebeians wrested from the patricians an equal share in the government of their common state. In Athens, on the other hand, it is true that the patriciate constitution was not formally set aside until the time of Solon, and not wholly even then ; still the ease with which the change was effected, as well as the significant fact that their γένη were distinctly recognized as artificial bodies, while the corresponding Latin *gentes* were assumed to be outgrowths of the family, proves that the territorial principle had practically superseded the patriarchal long before. It is a curious

* History of Rome, Vol. I. p. 202. † Ancient Law, p. 124.

fact that of the three Aryan races of Northern Europe, the Celts and Slavonians have preserved a large share of patriarchal institutions, while among the Teutons we find few traces of them.

Cæsar, to be sure (VI. 22), tells of a custom among the Germans very similar to the community in land of the Russian villages described by Mr. Maine; but he seems to know nothing of any sentiment of consanguinity as connected with the custom, and it would appear that the custom itself had gone into disuse before the time of Tacitus, who does not allude to it. It can hardly be doubted, however, that the *mark*, or whit of territory of the primitive Teutonic community, was identical in its nature with the *pagus* of the early Italians; and the *pagus* was in its origin the *family domain*, as is shown by the fact pointed out by Mommsen, that all the earliest local tribes (which were founded upon these *pagi*) bore the names of patrician clans, — Claudia, Æmilia, Fabia, Cornelia, etc. It would appear probable, then, that the cantonal organization, *Gauverfassung*, was common to both Italians and Germans, and was in both cases the outgrowth of original patriarchal institutions. This view of the family origin of the early Germanic institutions is further substantiated by the derivation of the word *king*, given by both Mr. Freeman and Max Müller, as "connected with the word *cyn* or *kin* (not with *kennen* or *können*). The king is the representative of the race, the embodiment of its national being, the child of his people, and not their father." (Vol. I. p. 82.) So we find, kings not of England, but of the English; just as in ancient times there was a king of the Lacedæmonians rather than of Lacedæmon.

Apart from the patriarchal character of early institutions, of which we find so meagre traces among Germanic peoples, there are one or two other points of analogy to classical institutions which may be mentioned here. The first is the elaborate political organism which is so characteristic of the Greeks and Romans, but so foreign to our notions at the present day. "All the nations of antiquity," says Niebuhr, "lived in fixed forms, and their political associations were organized, down to the lowest ranks." The complicated organization of the Roman state (in the "classes" and "centuries," for in-

stance) is familiar; the English divisions of *tithing* and *hundred* are of a similar numerical nature, and were, no doubt, originally applied to a definite number of families, just as we are told was the case with the Athenian γένος. But this artificial style of organism soon passed out of use in England, while in Rome the public assemblies continued to the end to be organized in artificial subdivisions.

Another interesting point of resemblance between Roman and Teutonic institutions, and one upon which our views of the latter largely depend, is the division of the people into two classes, — *eorls* and *ceorls* in England, corresponding to patricians and plebeians in Rome. Mr. Freeman says that these English distinctions are older than historical records; the same is true, in fact, in regard to the Roman divisions, even if the negative name *plebeian* is of later origin. All we can do, therefore, is to point out the analogy, and the probability that the inferior class had the same origin in each case, whatever that origin may have been. The practice of *commendation*, too, by which each ceorl was required, or at least expected, to attach himself to some noble, is the same in character with the Roman relation of clientship. But the client (*listener*) or dependant was a member of the earliest Roman society with which we are acquainted; that is, the primitive division in Rome was not merely into nobles and commonalty, but every member of the commonalty sustained a personal relation of dependence upon some patrician clan; while *commendation* appears to have been at first a purely voluntary relation, coming up in historical times, and only by degrees developed into a kind of servitude.

This question of the origin and necessity of commendation is closely connected with a larger one, which involves the fundamental character of Teutonic liberties. Mr. Freeman is a firm believer in these liberties, finding his evidence partly in the study of the earliest English institutions themselves, partly in that comparison of primeval institutions which we have already spoken of. In his view, the ceorl was no less a member of the English commonwealth than the eorl; naturally, then, he was not originally obliged to "commend" himself. This was at first a purely voluntary and mutually advan-

tageous act. Those writers, on the other hand, who take a more aristocratic view of early institutions, and consider the ceorls as an essentially inferior class, would look upon "commendation" as their original and necessary condition. The Roman plebeiate is of course an argument for the latter view. Mr. Freeman thinks that he finds nearer and more potent analogies for the primitive liberty of the ceorls, in the heroic age in Greece, and especially in the prevailing usages of other Teutonic nations.

This general view has its bearings upon every portion of the English constitution; but the most important single question upon which it bears is that of the constitution of the Witenagemót. It has always been admitted that no positive data existed to decide who had a right to be members of this body; it could, therefore, only be a matter of inference from the general character of the institutions, and the views held by different writers have been determined by their conception of this general character. Mr. Freeman, therefore, in consistency with his prevailing habits of thought, boldly adopts the view, which Mr. Hallam says "has long since been victoriously refuted," that even the ceorls had the right to attend the Gemóts, both of nation and shire; and finds support for his view in the analogies of the Homeric *Agora* and the public assemblies of the forest cantons of Switzerland. Indeed, even so late as the Arcadian Confederacy, established by Epaminondas, Mr. Grote says that "probably every Arcadian citizen from the constituent communities had the right of attending" the general assemblies held at Megalopolis." But then Mr. Grote, like Mr. Freeman, has a strong attraction towards the popular side of discussions of this nature; and as he gives no authority for this statement, and we have been able to find no direct testimony in ancient writers, we must assume that he, like Mr. Freeman, adopts this view from its agreement with his general understanding of Greek political institutions. At any rate, the ceorl was a citizen, not a slave.

However it may be with this particular point, it may fairly be claimed that all parts of the early English constitution are consistent with this view. The old controversy upon the distinction of *folcland* and *bocland* has, as is well known, been

settled upon this basis, that the *folcland* was the national domain, the undivided property of the people, while *bocland* was that portion of this land which was given out by deed, *boc*, to individuals; it was a significant result of the Norman conquest, an indication of the changed relation of king and people, that the *folcland*, the national domain, now became royal domain, just as the king by degrees was transformed from elective head of the nation to its absolute lord.

The nature of the Anglo-Saxon kingship is another point which harmonizes completely with Mr. Freeman's general view of the constitution; for he proves conclusively, what few now are disposed to deny, the purely elective character of the monarchy. The Witenagemót is shown to have possessed full power to elect a king, and even to depose him, — an act performed in the case of Sigebert of Wessex in 755, and apparently in that of Ethelred the Unready, and afterwards by the Parliament in the case of Edward II. and Richard II. This elective nature of the monarchy is of course of decisive importance in the Norman conquest. If Harold was lawful king by election, William could have no claim either by descent or bequest. To be sure, it was understood that the election was always to be made from the family of Cerdic, if a suitable member of that family existed; but Cnut was none the less a legitimate king, and William the Norman (who, for the matter of that, was no descendant of Cerdic) was careful to confirm his worthless title by a formal election. An elective monarchy, indeed, is pretty sure to fall into the hands of a family, and so become practically hereditary; as the German Empire, under the various lines, descended in nearly every case from father to son, as long as a direct transmission was possible, and then was transferred to some collateral branch. Thus Conrad III., founder of the Suabian house, was nephew of Henry V., the last Franconian emperor; and when the Luxemburg line became extinct with Sigismond, his son-in-law, Albert II. of Austria, succeeded. Even Hungary, Bohemia, and Poland, the kingdoms which longest remained elective in form, rarely raised a Matthias Corvinus, George Podiebrad, or John Sobieski to the throne; but the Piast line of Poland, the Angevin line of Hungary, and the Luxemburg line of Bohemia continued to reign until even

an heiress was able in each case to transfer her claim to her husband or son. Harold was as legitimate a king of England as Sobieski was of Poland. As Mr. Freeman says, "If Harold, Stephen, John, were usurpers, Aelfred and Eadward the Confessor were usurpers just as much," because neither of these was lawful heir, according to the modern rules of inheritance. And seeing that Edward the Confessor was present in England, while Edward the Outlaw was absent in Hungary, "to search over the world for the son of an elder brother, while the younger brother was close at hand, was an idea which would never have entered the mind of any Englishman of the eleventh century."

These rules of inheritance, we must remember, were created by the feudal system, and transferred from this to royalty. The royal office was at first strictly elective, under the modern European order of things, even if generally confined to one family; and when confined to one family, the choice was made from among its members, in such a way as to give the nation the best ruler practicable, — a mature Edred rather than a boy Edgar or Edwy. But inheritance was an essential feature of feudality, and must of course develop its principles and adhere to its rules of inheritance. Thus, though a son succeeded in preference to a daughter, yet even a daughter would succeed where there was no son. Of course in an elective monarchy females could not succeed, for the first object must be to secure the best *man*, to lead its armies and administer its concerns. Therefore when the feudal rules of inheritance were applied to the crown, France made an exception in this respect, and excluded females from the succession; while England adopted them in full, and counts an Elizabeth and Victoria with her Henrys and Georges.

The English liberties, — the English constitution as a pure and fully developed type of original Teutonic institutions, — this is the central idea of Mr. Freeman's history. England was eminently a free country, governed by the English people for themselves. They chose their own kings, made their own laws, controlled their own church. Nor did this constitution sacrifice order and prosperity to liberty. While the people of the Continent were overwhelmed by the calamities of that most calami-

tous age, the later Carolingian period,* England was at a height of glory and renown which no other nation could parallel. Under Edward the Elder, Athelstane, Edmund, Edred, and Edgar, England was the foremost nation of Europe; not highly civilized as we reckon civilization now, but for Europe in the tenth century pre-eminently peaceful, powerful, and enlightened. We are wrong, then, when we make English liberties begin with Magna Charta, just as we are wrong when we make English history begin with William the Conqueror. Before Magna Charta was signed, there were traditions and sentiments and institutions surviving from the Anglo-Saxon times, which formed so sure a foundation for the new liberties, that these could never again be lost; while the popular rights which were won upon the Continent in the fourteenth century, and which seemed as vigorous and promising as these, were at once undermined and destroyed by the monarchs in their day of triumph. From the earliest ages, the English, beyond all other people, have possessed the *political sense*, derived from the enjoyment of actual political rights; and to this they owe their superior freedom. The early constitution was, to be sure, overthrown by the Norman and Angevin kings; but under John and Henry III. "the old English liberties are won back in another form, and the modern constitution of England begins."

This important point is well illustrated by Mr. Freeman. Thus, at the death of Cnut, when Harold I. and Harthacnut were rival candidates for the throne: "There was perhaps in that age no country except England in which such a question could have been decided, except at cost of a civil war. But the firmly rooted principles of English law, the habit of constant meeting and discussion, had, even in that age, produced some germs of the feeling to which the great English historian of Greece has given the name of 'constitutional morality.' The controversy was a sharp one, but it was decided, not on the field of battle, but in the debates of the Witenagemót." (p. 538.) Again, of Earl Godwine (Vol. II. p. 35): "The importance attributed to his oratory, the fluctuations of success

* A striking illustration of the miseries of this age is the fact that in the year 1000 the city of Worms, on the Rhine, lay in ruins, plundered, indeed destroyed, by Normans from the West (probably not those of Normandy) and Hungarians from the East.

and defeat which he underwent in the great deliberative Assembly, show clearly how advanced our constitution already was in an age when free debate was so well understood, and when free speech was so powerful."

England, then, in the eleventh century, was distinguished from the leading states of the Continent by the fact of its still retaining unmixed its Teutonic nationality and its free Teutonic constitution. The Scandinavian states were like England in this; but then they were but just emerging from barbarism, anarchy, and heathenism, while England ranked with France and Italy in power and civilization. Germany, again, was purely Teutonic in nationality, but not in institutions; for she had borrowed the feudal system from France, and imperialism from Italy. But it was not in the order of things that England should remain in this isolation; the Norman conquest rudely broke it up, and brought England into the family of feudal nations. The essential difference, therefore, between the growth of English civilization and that of the nations of the Continent is, that the two great elements of modern society — the barbarian and the Roman — were in England fused at a much later date, in respect both to time and to national development. In France and Spain this fusion took place in the sixth century, while the Teutonic element was still rude and chaotic, and the civilization which it overwhelmed still retained a considerable degree of vigor: and naturally the barbarians were powerfully influenced by the more cultivated communities which they conquered. In Germany it did not occur until the ninth century, and there was no mixture of race; the imperial ideas and organization were imposed upon a purely Teutonic people, who had hardly begun to emerge from barbarism; here, too, therefore, the form of civilization and government was Roman. In all these countries the majestic forms and imposing memories of the Empire obtained a lasting ascendency over the primitive free constitution. In England, on the other hand, the Teutonic constitution had perhaps been carried to the fullest development of which it was by itself capable; and there was then brought in sudden contact with it, not the Roman civilization or pure imperial ideas, but that remarkable set of ideas and institutions which had resulted from the barbarian conquest.

"One effect of that mixture of refined Roman law with primitive barbaric usage which is known to us by the deceptive name of feudalism was to revive many features of archaic jurisprudence which had died out of the Roman world, so that the decomposition which had seemed to be over commenced again, and to some extent is still proceeding." * That is, the primitive Aryan institutions of ancient Rome had run their full course, culminating at last in imperialism; and now this fully developed principle was brought in contact with another set of cognate primitive institutions which were just commencing their development. Necessarily, therefore, feudalism, as well as the purely Teutonic institutions of England noticed above, finds many analogies in the early usages which Rome had long outgrown. Our plan does not require us to enter into these points, which Mr. Maine has discussed so fully; what concerns us is the effect upon the English constitution of this sudden and forced contact with feudality.

It is customary to say that the Norman Conquest introduced feudalism into England. This Mr. Freeman, with Sir Francis Palgrave, denies. "The most important of the formal changes in legislation, in language, in the system of government, and in the tenure of land," he says (p. 4), "were no immediate consequences of the conquest, no mere innovations of the reign of William. They were the developments of a later age, when the Norman as well as the Englishman found himself under the yoke of a foreign master. The distinct changes in law and government which we commonly attribute to William the Norman belong, in truth, in by far the greatest number of cases, to his great-grandson, Henry the Angevin." We must wait for his later volumes in order to get Mr. Freeman's reasons for this view; meanwhile, it may be that the question of the technical establishment of feudalism is in great measure one of definitions. Indeed, he pertinently asks (p. 97), "Did the feudal system ever exist anywhere?" — meaning by this, no doubt, that the very essence of feudalism is lack of system. Feudal elements he shows to have existed before the Conquest, in the usage of "thegnhood" and the occasional military tenure of land. "The Norman conquest no doubt

* Maine's Ancient Law, p. 130.

strongly tended to promote the further development of the feudal element; but, as in every other case, it only opened and prepared the way for further changes."

Leaving this question aside, for the present, there still remain most potent influences of the Norman conquest upon the English constitution, which we cannot better describe than in Mr. Freeman's own words, in the Introduction: —

"The Norman conquest is something which stands without a parallel in any other Teutonic land. If that conquest be only looked on in its true light, it is impossible to exaggerate its importance. And yet there is no event whose true nature has been more commonly and more utterly mistaken. No event is less fitted to be taken, as it too often has been taken, for the beginning of our national history. For its whole importance is not the importance which belongs to a beginning, but the importance which belongs to a turning-point. The Norman conquest brought with it a most extensive foreign infusion, which affected our blood, our language, our laws, our arts; still it was only an infusion; the older and stronger elements still survived, and in the long run they again made good their supremacy. So far from being the beginning of our national history, the Norman conquest was the temporary overthrow of our national being. But it was only a temporary overthrow. . . . . The whole importance of the Norman conquest consists in the effect which it had on an existing nation, humbled indeed, but neither wiped out nor utterly enslaved, in the changes which it wrought in an existing constitution, which was by degrees greatly modified, but which was never wholly abolished or wholly trampled under foot. William, king of the English, claimed to reign as the lawful successor of the kings of the English who reigned before him. He claimed to inherit their rights, and he professed to govern according to their laws. . . . .

"The Norman conquest, again, is an event which stands by itself in the history of Europe. It took place at a transitional period in the world's development. Those elements, Roman and Teutonic, imperial and ecclesiastical, which stood as it were side by side in the system of the early middle age, were then being fused together into the later system of feudal, papal, crusading Europe. The Conquest itself was one of the most important steps in the change. A kingdom which had hitherto been purely Teutonic was brought within the sphere of the laws, the manners, the speech of the Romance nations." — Vol. I. pp. 1 – 3.

Again in the Preface, he says of his view of the nature of the Conquest: —

"That view, I may say, is formed by uniting the views of the two most eminent writers who have dealt with the subject, Augustine Thierry and Sir Francis Palgrave. . . . . Each of these great writers must stand charged with considerable exaggeration on his own side of the question. Still, in the main, I think we may say that each is right in what he asserts, and wrong only in what he leaves out of sight. From one point of view the Norman conquest was nearly all that Thierry says that it was; from another point of view, it was hardly more than Sir Francis Palgrave says that it was." — p. vi.

In comparing the Norman conquest with the three earlier conquests of the island, the earliest, that by the Romans, may be left out of consideration, for the reason that, although it was far from being without influence upon the subsequent fortunes of the island, this influence was only indirect. The Romans withdrew from Britain, leaving civilization and Christianity behind them. The Jutes, Saxons, and Angles came in their place, but not merely to conquer; the Britons as a race were exterminated, their religion and culture annihilated; and a century and a half after the Romans left the island, it was in the possession of savage, unlettered heathen. This was the English, or Anglo-Saxon, conquest. In those distant, half-mythical times we need not concern ourselves with the details of this Conquest further than to remember that, in Mr. Freeman's words, "in the course of the fifth and sixth centuries, a succession of tribes of kindred origin, all of the same Low-Dutch stock, and speaking essentially the same Low-Dutch language, landed at various points of the British coast, gradually forced their way inland, and founded permanent Teutonic kingdoms." They were isolated tribes at first, headed by *Ealdormen;* in time tribes united into nations, the ealdormen became kings; and because seven of these kingdoms attained a considerable degree of power and permanence, we know this first, disunited stage of English nationality as the *Heptarchy.* Of these seven kingdoms only three reached a high degree of power, and seriously disputed with one another the *hegemony*, as we may call it, of the Heptarchy. In the seventh century Northumbria, in the eighth Mercia, seemed on the point of grasping

dominion over the whole; but at last Wessex outstripped them both. It is easy to see why these three were the strong powers in England. Essex, Sussex, and Kent were necessarily circumscribed within their original narrow territories and were short-lived; East Anglia, though more extensive than these, was equally cut off from growth; but Wessex, Mercia, and Northumbria, being all border lands, had no check to their aggressions and conquests against Welsh and Scotch, and to these three growth was a law of nature.

Of the three kindred races who thus founded the English Heptarchy Mr. Freeman observes, that "to the united nation the Angle had given his name, the Saxon had given his royal dynasty; the Jute, the least considerable in the extent of his territorial possession, had been, according to all tradition, the first to lead the way to a permanent settlement." Why the Angle gave his name to the united nation, rather than the Saxon who united it, is at first sight puzzling, but is after all not hard to explain. For the Angles fill a much more important place in early history; it was during the period of the Heptarchy that the name "English" became established, and this period is mostly made up of contentions between the two great Anglian monarchies of Mercia and Northumbria. It was not until Mercia seemed at last within reach of supreme dominion, under the great Offa and his son, that Wessex of a sudden sprang to greatness, and made even Mercia and Northumbria her vassals. So far as appears, therefore, it was merely the accident of the man Egbert, which decided that all England should be united under the royal house of Wessex rather than that of Mercia; and England had come to know herself as the *land of the Angles* during the long period of Anglian predominance. *Saxon*, on the other hand, as Mr. Freeman observes, was the name by which the native Britons, as well as the Scotch, knew the united people, because it was the Saxon invaders that they became first acquainted with on any large scale, and this name had thus become established among the Welsh as the name of their foes, long before the Anglian invasions began.

To the Saxons and Angles — for the Jutes of Kent may be neglected — were soon added a third kindred race, the Danes, who occupied much of the North of England, as a nationality,

and who for a season founded a royal dynasty. In the Anglo-Saxon and Danish conquests of the island, Mr. Freeman points out a certain degree of analogy, in that each passed through the two stages of occasional *plundering expeditions* and of *permanent settlements;* the Danish invasions in time passed to a third stage, that of *political conquest*, when the house of Gorm the Old supplanted that of Cerdic for a few years. Of course there was no political conquest of Britain by the Angles and Saxons, for they exterminated the nation which they found upon the soil, and destroyed or at least expelled its government; so that they founded a new state in place of making themselves masters of one that already existed. The Danish invasions, which began even before the time of Egbert, were suspended for a while during the reigns of his great successors. There was little temptation to harry a realm ruled by Athelstane or Edgar. Since England, therefore, was no longer a safe point of attack, the Danes, or Normans, carried their energies to the coasts of the Continent, where a weak and disorganized government gave them assurance of rich plunder and little danger. The grant of Normandy to Rollo, in 914, was about twenty-five years after the Peace of Wedmore, between Alfred and Guthrum. But when the line of great sovereigns was at an end, and the inglorious Ethelred occupied the throne of "Glorious Athelstane," the Danes reappeared, and were not long in overthrowing the reigning dynasty and establishing a new one in the same government. Cnut, Harold, and Harthacnut were Danish kings of England, not founders of a new realm, like Cerdic, Ella, and Ida. The Norman conquest differs from both English and Danish, in belonging exclusively to the third stage: it was a political conquest of an established nation by an organized government, and resulted (nominally, at least) in nothing but a change of dynasty. This difference in character of the three conquests results not merely from the altered condition of the conquered country, but from the difference in political development of the three conquering nations. The Angles, Saxons, and Jutes, who plundered and settled in the fifth century, were pure barbarians and heathens; and their war against the Christian Celts whom they found occupying the country was one of extermination. One race displaced another. The

Danish conquest, on the other hand, was precisely analogous to the invasion of Gaul by the Franks and Burgundians, except in the important fact that the Danes and English were of the same race. A heathen horde precipitated itself upon a Christian country, harried it, and at last occupied it; but instead of displacing the former possessors, the invaders united with them and soon assimilated with them. The conquerors were themselves conquered; like the Franks and Visigoths, they adopted the language, religion, and institutions of their enemies, and the Danish Cnut was one of the most English of kings. But the Normans were themselves civilized and Christian; they did not exterminate, like the Angles and Saxons, nor become merged with the existing nation, like the Danes. Their conquest was subjugation.

The continuousness of English history is, as we have seen, the fundamental idea of Mr. Freeman's work. From the days of Cerdic, he claims, till now, it has been one nation, which has had a steady development and a constant tendency to unity, hardly interrupted by the Norman conquest, and not interrupted at all by the Danish conquest. He lays more stress, therefore, than we see reason for doing upon the seven *Bretwaldas*, or *wielders of Britain*, given by the Chronicles; these he thinks must have possessed some distinct and acknowledged rank, although he acknowledges that it is hard to see why the names of Ethelbald and Offa, the powerful kings of the eighth century, should be omitted. For our part, we are inclined to agree with Mr. Hallam and attribute less importance to these Bretwaldas than Mr. Freeman does. Certainly a list that omits Offa can have no real importance. We should be inclined to suspect that the sacredness of the number seven was the reason that only seven names are given before Egbert.

But however it may have been with Ella, Ceawlin, and Ethelbert, after the Heptarchy came real "Bretwaldas," — the great kings of the tenth century. And here we shall be more ready to agree with Mr. Freeman, in his view of the imperial nature of the English monarchy, resting on the successive conquests of the English kingdoms, and the voluntary or involuntary submission of the several Celtic kingdoms to the most potent prince of the island. Athelstane, Edmund, and Edgar were, he holds,

not merely kings of England, they were *emperors of Britain*, having the Celtic Princes of Wales, Strathclyde, and Scotland as *under-kings* or vassals. The establishment of this imperial rule was gradual. Egbert and Alfred exercised a doubtful and disputed sway over all the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. Edward the Elder finally overthrew the nationality of Mercia, and incorporated it with his kingdom of Wessex, as his ancestors had done with Essex and Sussex; further, he received the homage of all the other states of Britain. "The Princes of Wales, Northumberland, Strathclyde, and Scotland, all submitted to him by a voluntary act; 'they chose him to father and to lord.'" Under Athelstane another step was taken; Northumberland was united with Wessex and Mercia into the kingdom of England, — the other states of the Heptarchy had been long since swallowed up, — while the sovereignty over the Celtic kingdoms still continued, and indeed was never formally suspended after this time, but formed the basis of the claim of Edward I., in 1291.

In view of the imperial character thus ascribed to the English crown, the high-sounding titles assumed by the kings of England are vindicated, but not as Hallam says (Vol. II. p. 362), because these monarchs "prefer to the name of a king, which was associated in all the Germanic nations with a limited power, the more indefinite appellations of *imperator* and *basileus*." They were satisfied with limited power; they were constitutional kings, ruling by consent of the nation, and with the aid of the Witan. But "such titles," says Mr. Freeman (Vol. I. p. 128), "were not assumed at random." His view of the precise nature of these imperial titles, the arguments for which we will not stay to discuss, is well stated: —

"My own belief, briefly to sum it up, is that vanity and the love of sounding titles may well have had some secondary share in the matter, but yet that these titles were seriously meant as a distinct assertion of the imperial position of the English crown. But I do not believe that there was the least thought of any succession from the ancient provincial emperors [Carausius, etc.], or from any phantom of imperial sovereignty which may have lingered on among the Welsh at the time of the English conquest or afterwards. I believe that these titles were assumed in order at once to claim for the English crown an absolute

independence of the Roman Empire, and to assert its right to the same sort of superiority over all the princes of Britain as the Emperor exercised, or claimed to exercise, over all the princes of the Continent." — Vol. I. p. 146.

He continues: —

"The imperial titles last in common use down to the Norman conquest; after that their employment is rare, and they gradually die out altogether. And why? Because the Norman and Angevin kings, though by no means disposed willingly to abate a tittle of the rights of their predecessors within the four seas of Britain, were far from looking on insular dominion as the main object of their policy. They were kings of England, and they knew the strength and value of England; still they valued England mainly as a nursery of men and a storehouse of money to serve their projects of Continental ambition. Primarily they were Counts of Anjou, Dukes of Normandy and Aquitaine, striving after an equality with, perhaps a superiority over, their own liege lord at Paris. The British Empire in which Æthelstan gloried, and in which Cnut, in the midst of his Northern triumphs, gloried hardly less, was something which seemed hardly worth keeping in the eyes of Richard and was something which could hardly be kept in the feeble grasp of John and Henry the Third. At last, in the great Edward, there again arose a true Bretwalda, one who saw that the dominion of Æthelstan and Edgar was a worthier prize than shadowy dreams of aggrandizement beyond the sea." — Vol. I. p. 159.

At this point Mr. Freeman clears up a confusion which exists in most minds in regard to the Scottish question, arising from "inattention to historical geography." What is now Scotland consists of three distinct parts, — Scotland proper (the Highlands), purely Celtic; the southwestern counties, also Celtic in the main, forming originally a part of the kingdom of Strathclyde; and Lothian, purely English, a part of the kingdom of Northumberland. The Celtic king of Scotland proper "commended" himself to Edward the Elder, A. D. 924. Cumberland, the northern portion of Strathclyde, — including, besides the county of Cumberland, the Scotch counties of Dumfries, Ayrshire, etc., — was conquered by King Edmund, and granted by him as a fief to Malcolm, king of the Scots, A. D. 945. Lothian, an integral portion of England, was granted in the same way by Edgar or Cnut to the Scottish king. There was,

therefore, properly no question whatever as to the sovereignty of England over all of Scotland south of the Forth and Clyde. Northern Scotland, on the other hand, was never *subject* to England, was never *granted* by an English king as a fief; "but Constantine [king of Scotland] and his people, by their own act [the 'commendation' to Edward the Elder], put themselves in the same position as if it had been so granted." (p. 137.)

It resulted from these grants that Scotland was by degrees transformed from a Celtic to a Teutonic monarchy. The wild and sparsely settled Highlands were no match, in importance, for the Lowlands; and naturally enough the kings transferred the seat of their government to what was now the most central and convenient part of their dominions. Edinburgh — Edwin's borough, founded by the famous Edwin, king of Northumbria — became the capital of the enlarged monarchy; and Lothian, the old English kingdom of Bernicia, became the Scotland of history. Nor was this all. In the eleventh century the dynasty itself became English. Malcolm II., Canmore, after overthrowing Macbeth with the aid of the English Earl Siward, married the sister of Edgar Atheling, the last representative of the direct line of Alfred; and through her not only was the blood of Cerdic transmitted to all the later kings of England, but to the kings of Scotland as well; so that the royal house of Scotland now became half English. And just as after the Conquest the pure English names — with the sole exception of Edward — disappear from the list of kings, and instead of Alfreds, Ethelreds, and Edmunds, we have Williams, Henrys, and Richards, so from this time we see no more of the Scotch names, no more Kenneths, Malcolms, Duncans, and Donalds, but Davids, Alexanders, Roberts, and Jameses.

Consistently with this general principle of the continuousness of English history, Mr. Freeman insists strenuously upon the use of the word "English" for the earliest times, discarding "Saxon" and "Anglo-Saxon." This practice he has defended in a long Appendix to the first volume, and, so far as the word "Saxon" is concerned, we fully agree with him. The Saxons, we all know, were in the South of England, the

Angles in the North; and the united people took the name of the more numerous and powerful Angles, rather than that of the Saxons; although the latter name, as we have said above, is that by which the English were called by their Celtic neighbors. But with regard to the term "Anglo-Saxon," matters stand somewhat differently, and our author admits that it was used in that period, not often, to be sure, still often enough to give it authority; but not, he says, in the sense in which we use it nowadays. "By 'Anglo-Saxons,' I conceive, in the vulgar use of the word, is meant Saxons who settled in England (meaning, of course, in Britain), as opposed to the Old Saxons who stayed in Germany." (p. 607.) If this is the "vulgar use of the word," we certainly agree with him that it should be at once discarded. But we doubt his correctness in this. For our own part, we have always understood it to be employed in precisely the sense in which he says it was used by Florence of Worcester and King Athelstane. "'King of the Anglo-Saxons,' as a title of Æthelstan, or Eadred, meant simply 'king of the Angles and Saxons.'" It is therefore correct, he proceeds to say, to speak of a king of the Anglo-Saxons, but not of a subject as "an Anglo-Saxon." This we admit. We admit, too, that in strictness of speech, "as a *chronological* term, 'Anglo-Saxon' is equally objectionable with 'Saxon.' The 'Anglo-Saxon period,' so far as there ever was one, is going on still." Old-English is undoubtedly the correct term; still, we doubt whether Anglo-Saxon has not become too firmly established to be uprooted; and if it is used in its true sense, we do not know that we need quarrel with it, especially as it possesses great convenience.

Even Mr. Freeman tacitly recognizes the broad gulf in English which separates the times before and after the Conquest, by his way of spelling proper names. His arguments for his practice are certainly very strong. The common orthography is, it is true, "a mere chaos of French and Latin corruptions, following no principle of any kind," while there is a curious inconsistency in making a special rule for familiar names like Alfred and Edward, while giving the correct form of names like Ealdred and Ælfgar. But, after all, whether consistent or not, we are all familiar with the corruptions Athelstane,

Ethelred, Edwy, and Edith, and we doubt whether anything is gained by insisting upon Æthelstan, Æthelred, Eadwig, and Eadgyth. It certainly has the effect of breaking the continuity, which he is so justly solicitous to preserve.

This Teutonic England, peaceful, prosperous, free, was separated only by the narrow channel from a land of a totally different character. The Normans were, it is true, cousins of the English, both of them dwellers in a land which they had conquered; but while the English had retained and developed their Teutonic institutions, hardly affected in any material degree by outside influences, the Normans had become completely Romanized. The language of the English was purely Teutonic; their names were, without exception, native; while the Normans spoke French, and their chief, Rolf, took the French name Robert. But these were slight points of difference. The essential contrast was in the fact that the Normans had become thoroughly permeated with the imperial and feudal ideas which prevailed upon the Continent, the innermost spirit of which was despotism. This was rather a contrast in spirit than in form or admitted powers. The king of France was certainly far weaker than the king of England. Cnut was a true king, while Robert had but a show of authority; and yet Cnut's was an *imperium legitimum*, a power defined by laws, while Robert was of right a monarch. The earls of England even were not inferior to the dukes of France in the essentials of power. Siward of Northumberland and Leofric of Mercia were as mighty potentates as Baldwin of Flanders or William of Aquitaine; but Siward and Leofric ruled over free Englishmen, while Baldwin and William lorded it over serfs.

We are perhaps too prone to look merely at the form of feudalism, to analyze it as a question of antiquities, and define it as consisting in such and such institutions and usages. So far as it goes, this method is correct. Feudalism, properly so called, did consist in special forms and customs; and as these forms did not exist in England to their full extent before the conquest, feudalism did not exist there. But, after all, a more potent reason why it did not exist in England is because the spirit which underlies it was not at home there. For the

spirit of feudalism is even more essential than its forms. Its forms grew out of the peculiar relation which the Germanic nobility sustained to king, commons, and land; its spirit was a bequest from the last centuries of the Roman Empire, when the traditions of Roman liberty had wholly vanished in the presence of a despotism Oriental in its nature. The empire of Constantine and his successors has been aptly termed a *sultanate;* in its presence all sense of popular liberties was lost, and all legitimate power was attributed to the master. It is not necessary here to trace the history of this imperial idea, which has had such momentous consequences in the later fortunes of Europe. It is enough here to indicate the transformation of the free companions of Clovis, Alaric, and Theodoric, leaders of the freemen of their own race, into the feudal aristocracy, lords over serfs and villains. The essential point in this transformation is, that the idea of absolutism was transferred, as it were, to the barons; when the supreme power was split up among a multitude of feudal nobles, these nobles could not, to be sure, conceive themselves as the possessors of imperial power, but towards their subjects they had become imbued in full degree with the notions of imperial prerogative and of the nothingness of the commonalty. With this new type of aristocracy, goodness consists in condescension, not in a recognition of common humanity; and the revolt of the peasants of Normandy in 997, mercilessly crushed by Richard the "Good," was at once a protest against the new order of things and a commentary on its character.

Feudalism, then, as we find it fully developed in the eleventh century, was not merely the rule of a landed aristocracy, even graded and hereditary, but of a haughty, supercilious aristocracy, who had forgotten their own origin, and fancied themselves beings of a different order from their vassals. The Church, equally arrogant, found itself the best friend and ally of feudalism. When we ask, therefore, whether the Conquest introduced feudalism into England, we must look at the question from the two points of view. As Mr. Freeman says, elements of feudalism existed in England long before the Conquest; the personal relation of commendation and *thegnhood*, and the reciprocal relation of tenure of land by military ser-

vice, both existed in England; and these — with subinfeudation and the quality of inheritance — are the essential features of feudality. He says, further, that these elements were not formally developed into the *feudal system* until the reign of Henry of Anjou; and here again no doubt he is right. But how of the time between the Conquest and the Plantagenets? If the feudal system did not exist, no more did the old Teutonic constitution of England continue in force. The truth is, that with all the elements of feudality existing, the feudal system as such could not have been developed in England so long as the spirit of English liberties inspired the nation. The chief result of the Conquest was, not a change of form, but an entire and immediate change of spirit; an infusion into the English institutions of just what was needed to develop feudalism. William perhaps wished to be a lawful king of England, as Cnut, another conqueror, had been. But he did not know how. He did not understand the nation that he came to govern, and, with the best will in the world, could not prevent the change from a free Teutonic monarchy to a monarchy of the imperial type; while his barons again, in spite of their English titles, could not be English earls, but at once set themselves — perhaps without meaning it — to transform English institutions after the model of those of France. This work was completed during the reigns of the Norman kings, and England thus made ready for the formal changes of Henry II.

This, then, was the effect of the Norman conquest upon England itself; the overthrow, at least for a season, of a noble structure of political liberty, by the rude hands of ignorant and arrogant barons, and the transformation of a purely Teutonic kingdom into a kingdom of the Continental type, ruled by ignorant, feudal, and ecclesiastical ideas. It is perhaps idle to ask whether this was on the whole a misfortune or not. It is certain that English liberties were not rooted up; they were won back again in the thirteenth century by the descendants of these very barons who now trampled them under foot, and were afterwards developed in a steady, healthy growth, unexampled among the nations of the Continent. The Conquest was only partial; despotism ruled only

for a time, while the native spirit of the nation was gathering strength for a new contest. It was not, therefore, a permanent evil. Nay, it may be that it was not an evil at all, except to those immediately affected by it. There were in England before the Conquest elements of disintegration, a laxness and rudeness of organization, which were in fact the cause of the nation's overthrow; it could not stand against the stern discipline and compact and organized power of the Normans. To attain the highest greatness of which she was capable, this vigorous but crude nation needed another element, which she found in her Norman conquerors.

The English people must, no doubt, have passed through the same stages of political development with the rest of Europe. High as they stood in the eleventh century, in regard to political capacity, they were hardly ready for a definitive organization of their several elements. Monarchy, aristocracy, municipal life, ecclesiasticism, must all run their course independently of each other, before they could be fused into one nationality. Perhaps, then, it is fortunate that the feudal and monarchical principles were represented in England by the most wonderful race in Europe for concentrated energy and power. Whatever may have been the cause, these Romanized Northmen surpassed all their contemporaries in the qualities of greatness. England already possessed all the elements of freedom; with the Norman conquest she acquired also the elements of power; Anglo-Saxon liberties, a Norman nobility, Norman blood in the sovereigns,—these were the best materials out of which to fashion the glorious England of the seventeenth century. But, on the other hand, while England owes much of her political greatness to the conquering stock, it would seem none the less true that her social weakness is largely due to this same Conquest. Undoubtedly the various elements of society have failed to be fused in England as they have been in Germany and France. The antagonisms of class are much more violent; with all the national pride and sense of honor, she has, after all, no *nationality* like that of France, or even that of inglorious, disunited Germany. This social weakness of England, no less than her political vigor, she owes to her Norman nobility, however largely recruited from Anglo-Saxon ranks.

As a European event, the Norman conquest was hardly less momentous than in its relations to England itself. And that not merely by extending the European system over a new nation, nor by the long train of wars and contentions between England and France which sprang indirectly from this event, but because it was the first great act in the new life of Europe that was just beginning, great in its effects as well as in itself. Mediæval Europe was the work of two men, Otho the Great and Gregory VII.; or, if we deny the historic influence of great men, and hold to the irresistible development of events, this development took place in a peculiar degree at two periods, the middle of the tenth and the close of the eleventh century, which are represented by these two men. For Charlemagne, a greater man than either of them, could only prepare the way for these, — could only sketch a scheme which Otho carried out, so far as it was in any way practicable. The Saxon emperors, Henry the Fowler and Otho the Great, brought order out of the anarchy into which the world had fallen after the death of Charlemagne, secured Christian Europe against the heathen Slaves and Hungarians, and founded that great temporal power which was, it is true, overthrown three centuries later when it had done its work, but which, for a season, was the chief guaranty for the order of Europe.

For a hundred years the empire grew in strength and majesty, reaching its culmination under the great Henry III. And to appreciate the debt of gratitude which Europe owes to this early empire, we have only to look at the disastrous condition of France at this time, where feudalism was triumphant, where the nation, indeed, hardly existed at all. The strong arm of the Othos and Henrys preserved Germany and Italy from this. But then, when the temporal power had reached its height, and had itself restored purity and dignity to the Church, a greater man than either Otho I. or Henry III. began the contest which only ended in the complete overthrow of the empire. Of this great struggle of two centuries, the central event of mediæval history, the Normans were the first instruments of the Popes, as the Angevins were the instruments of their final triumph. Leo IX., under whom the papacy began its new life, made the Norman Robert Guiscard his

faithful vassal, and the Norman dynasty of Naples and Sicily was at once the nearest and truest supporter of the papal see; while the Norman William the Bastard entered into a similar partnership with Alexander II., — Hildebrand being the leading spirit in the counsels of Alexander as well as of Leo.

Mr. Freeman, in his third volume, shows with great clearness and force the relation between William and the papal see, and the importance which the Norman conquest possesses in the career of the papacy. It will be remembered that the English Church had never come so completely under the sway of Rome as the Church of the Continental nations. England was distant and insulated, and the same popular rights that existed in political affairs were also maintained in some degree in ecclesiastical affairs. Neither did there seem much reason to pay homage and submission to such Popes as wore the tiara during the tenth century and the first half of the eleventh. England controlled her own Church just as she did after the time of Henry VIII., just as all nations did before the ninth century. But to the Normans, faithful sons of the mother Church, this was one of the English usages which was least understood and caused most scandal. When the Norman favorites of Edward the Confessor were expelled in the popular uprising after the return of Godwine in 1052, Robert of Jumièges, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Ulf, Bishop of Dorchester, were obliged to flee; their sees were declared vacant, and were filled with Englishmen. "That the king and his Witan," says Mr. Freeman, "would be stepping beyond their powers in filling these sees was not likely to come into any man's head. . . . . What the king and his Witan gave, the king and his Witan could doubtless take away, and they accordingly proceeded to deal with the sees of the outlawed bishops exactly as they could have dealt with the earldoms of outlawed earls." At any earlier period of history it would have ended here; never before would the Roman bishop have refused to recognize ecclesiastics thus appointed. But this was just at the turning-point of church history, — the pontificate of Leo IX., the beginning of the career of Gregory VII. Stigand, the newly appointed primate, was never acknowl-

edged by the Pope, was refused his pallium, and was degraded at the first opportunity. But this was a small matter. England herself was put under the ban of the Church, and the Norman invasion had for an object no less to maintain the canons of the Church against an insubordinate nation, than to enforce a claim to the throne, which might have been respected on the Continent, but had absolutely no authority in England, whether on hereditary grounds or as resting upon Edward's gift.

When William preferred his claim to the crown of England, and submitted the decision to Pope Alexander II., this gave precisely the opportunity desired by the great man who ruled the Pope, and furnished a precedent which he was not slow to turn to account and develop even further, when he became Pope himself. We need not question the sincerity of any one of the three parties concerned. William, a reverent follower of the Pope, admitted no doubt his right to adjudicate on a disputed succession, far as he would have been from admitting the claim into which this grew, of disposing of thrones at his will. Harold, a lawfully elected king of England, in every respect a representative of the institutions of his native land, justly spurned the proposal of submitting a question of purely English law to the decision of a foreign ecclesiastic. Hildebrand on his part eagerly grasped the opportunity for controlling temporal powers; but probably he neither understood nor appreciated the real nature of Harold's claim. To him he seemed nothing but a usurper, because he did not belong to the royal family; and as between the two, Hildebrand honestly believed William's shadow of hereditary right a better title than any that Harold could put in.

It would have been hard, in the middle of the eleventh century, to forecast the future of the three great nations of Europe. It would have seemed that Germany, then held firmly in the strong grasp of Henry III., was to develop into a vigorous and united monarchy, rather than France, which, under the nominal rule of Henry I., was nothing but a congeries of disunited provinces. Even England, free as it was, seemed likely, under such earls as Siward and Godwin, and showing such a sense of provincial independence as is illustrated by Tostig's

insurrection, to fall to pieces again rather than to unite. Indeed, but for the powerful influence of the Norman conquest, it may be doubted whether the centrifugal tendencies would not have proved too strong to be resisted. To the Normans, perhaps, quite as much as to the native English, England owes that wonderful constitution which has secured at once unity of the whole and vigor of the parts, — almost the only constitution of modern Europe which has been able for any length of time to combine strength and liberty.

So far as Mr. Freeman's work extends, it leaves little to be desired either in the narration of events or the discussion of their significance and bearings. We shall look with interest for his succeeding volumes, to find described as graphically and vigorously the measures by which the conquered nation was held in subjection, the process by which feudal institutions became established in England, and finally the growth of a new political system, nobler than that which had been overthrown, because stronger and no less free.

W. F. Allen.

Art. VII. — *Paris en Décembre*, 1851. *Étude Historique sur Le Coup d'État.* Par Eugene Ténot. Paris. 1868.

The book which forms the subject of this article was published early in the autumn of 1868, and had, in the following December, reached its eleventh edition. The aim of M. Ténot is sufficiently manifest from the date of his Preface, July 14, 1868, for the 14th of July is the anniversary of the taking of the Bastile. Of M. Ténot himself there is very little to be said. He is a Parisian journalist of reputation, and one of the editors of the *Siècle*, — that is to say, a Republican. In 1865 he published a book on the *Coup d'État en Province*, which was very favorably received, and he has been urged and induced to follow it up by a study of the *Coup d'État* in Paris, a much more arduous task, from the difficulty of getting at the truth "through the mire of calumnies, falsehoods, dis-

guised incidents, and garbled documents in which the facts lie buried."

A new generation has grown up in the eighteen years since the *coup d'état* was accomplished; and where shall they go to learn the truth regarding the system under which they live? The history of the time just past is always the least known, because it is vaguely familiar to every one, and it takes much time and energy to collate newspapers, hunt through periodicals, and find out what was truth and what was gossip. The French newspapers of the time of the *coup d'état* were gagged, with the exception of two or three, known to be safe, and are consequently valueless for the purposes of history; the French reviews thought it not the time to deal with the situation, and were wisely silent; and the official documents, though printed and published, are not more accessible than official documents usually are. Louis Napoleon's friends and followers gave their version of what occurred in December, 1851, and have repeated it from time to time ever since. Any one, anxious to know what they have had to say, had better, without wading through Belouino and Mayer and Manduit, refer to M. Granier de Cassagnac's productions, — at once the best and the worst of their kind, — either the *Récit populaire des Événements de Decembre*, 1851, which appeared in 1852, and which is not now very easy to get, or to the more elaborate account in the second volume of his *Histoire de la Chute de Louis Philippe et du Rétablissement de l'Empire* (1857). The story is told as M. Granier de Cassagnac can tell a story; he has been trained in that school of French journalism which handles a pen and a sword equally well, which can stab a man with a sneer one day, and shoot him for resenting it the next; and he has written no line which, for its dulness, he would wish to blot. In 1851 he was on the staff of the *Constitutionnel*, and he has incorporated some of his very telling articles into his book. The *Constitutionnel*, the ardent prophet of the Empire, was, in those days, under the control of Dr. Véron, and, in the sixth volume of his Memoirs, there are many details of the wires and wire-pullers of the time, perhaps not always accurate, but very amusing. The Memoirs were published in 1857, and had, as the French say, a great suc-

cess of curiosity; but they met with many contradictions, and he was obliged to publish his New Memoirs, and to give his authorities. Even then he did not have a success of truth.

The writings on the other side labor under the disadvantage of having been written out of France, by Frenchmen who could only give their word for their accuracy, or by foreigners, like Mr. Kinglake, whose most interesting chapter (Invasion of the Crimea, Vol. I. Chap. XIV.) has all the unreality of a fine fable. M. Ténot is a Frenchman, living in France, with all the usual facilities and some unusual ones for writing this history, used to hard literary work, and eager to do this special thing. He derived his information from the official documents, so that there is not one word in the book which the government could suppress, and he tells the story as simply as possible, without comment of any sort. This is a great gain to us who read him across the broad or the narrow seas; for, though the fire below is felt throughout the work, there is none of that phrase-making that is so natural to a Frenchman, and so unpleasant to the unrhetorical Englishman.

The history of France up to 1848 is well known. From 1830 to 1848 the French lived and prospered under a constitutional monarchy. It was an experiment, but it seemed to work well enough. The king read the English papers; the royal family lived like English gentlemen and ladies; the deputies did a vast amount of talking; the people made endless fun of the king; and there was no reason why this state of things should not have endured, had the king been a little wiser, or M. Guizot a little more flexible. But the demands made by the Opposition in 1847 for an extension of the suffrage were received by the king with extreme irritation, which he showed in his speech at the opening of the Chambers, December 27, 1847. On the 1st of January, 1848, he lost his best friend and counsellor, his more than sister, Madame Adelaide. In the debates that followed the address from the throne, the king's foolish words were harped upon incessantly; there were loud complaints of the interdiction of a great socialist banquet, which was to have taken place February 22d. On the 21st of February there were signs of an impending riot in Paris. That

evening the king said, "All this does not amount to anything: it is only the talk of the *cafés*"; and again, speaking of the irritation of the deputies of the left, "It is a fire of straw, a fire of straw!" He seems to have learnt the temper of his people from the English papers, — not the safest of interpreters in such a matter. On the 22d fighting began in the streets; on the 23d, concession began in the cabinet; on the 24th, Emile de Girardin burst into the king's room and asked him to abdicate, and he abdicated. He signed the act of abdication very slowly, but as quickly as his gloved hand would permit, and an hour or so later, fled from Paris, — a man of straw flying before a fire of straw; for when this had burnt itself out, it was clear that no one had wished the king to go, and that no one was glad of what had happened, except, indeed, the Duchesse de Montpensier, who had got out of the country with a good deal of difficulty, and who greatly preferred the risks and excitement of her escape to the dull decency of the royal home at the Tuileries. The year that followed was a dreadful year of anarchy, — anarchy tempered by Lamartine's speeches; and it ended in the declaration of a Republic which no one wished for, and the formation of a Constitution of which no one approved.

At this point M. Ténot begins his book, and his introductory chapter is devoted to a brief summary of the events which took place between the Presidential election of 1848 and the 2d of December, 1851. The Republican Constitution was definitively voted November 4, 1848. The government was divided between two powers, an Assembly, the thinking, willing brain; and a President, the obedient executive arm. The President was to be elected by universal suffrage for four years, and was not to be re-eligible until after an interval of four years. The Constitution was subject to revision, and every Assembly, in its third and last session, had a right to order such a revision, and by a vote of three fourths to call a special Assembly for that purpose. Universal suffrage, freedom of the press, and freedom of assemblage were assured; and it was these great advantages which reconciled the majority to the objectionable features of the Constitution and carried it through. It was, however, a compromise between the democratic hopes and the

monarchical traditions of France, and contained in itself the principles of its own destruction. The party of reaction in the Assembly had made a skilful use of the impression left by the dreadful days of June, 1848, to infuse as much monarchism as possible into the Constitution, — so that the Republican Constitution of Republican France retained all the evils of the monarchy, and added to them all the dangers of democracy. It maintained entire that civil organization which was the work of the first Napoleon after the 18th Brumaire, — "that network of centralization which stifles individual and corporate resistance, and prepares the way for the despotism of an assembly or of an emperor," * and which renders necessary an immense army of functionaries, all, of course, easily bought by a chief, president, or other; it confirmed the Concordat, thus subsidizing the clergy, who were all, of course, hostile to democracy; it kept up a large standing army, recruited by conscription, ready to follow any leader, above all a Bonaparte; finally, it gave the choice of the magistrates to the President; so that, in case of any collision between the Assembly and the President, the Assembly had the right to accuse the President and bring him to trial before a High Court, if only the President, who had the army, the functionaries, the priests, and the magistrates at his back, should choose to be brought. The Constituent Assembly had, indeed, taken one precaution against any act of violence on the part of the executive, — a precaution showing its sturdy confidence in the goodness of human nature. Article sixty-eight of the Constitution declared that any measure by which the President dissolved or prorogued the National Assembly, or put any obstacle in the way of its mandate, was a crime of high treason. By this act alone he was to be considered deprived of his functions, and all citizens were commanded to refuse him obedience. Article forty-eight ordered that the President should take an oath to the Republic and to the Constitution. He alone was to take this oath; all other functionaries were exempt.

The two leading candidates for the Presidency were General Eugène Cavaignac and Louis Napoleon Bonaparte. Cavaignac had been at the head of the executive since June, 1848, and

* De Tocqueville.

was perhaps the man of the time best fitted for the position of President. He was brave, patriotic, disinterested; the worst Granier de Cassagnac can find to say of him is that he was good, but not good enough.

Louis Napoleon's early life is too well known to bear retelling. He was the nephew and heir of Napoleon I. The Revolution of February found him in England, and he came at once to Paris. By a curious accident, the packet which brought him over to Boulogne carried back to England the Duke de Nemours, who had remained in Paris a day longer than his father, to secure, if possible, the throne to his brother's children. The Duke's two faithful friends, who had accompanied him to Boulogne, were waiting in the railway-carriage that was to take them back to Paris, when the door opened suddenly, and in came two men, the Prince Louis Bonaparte, whom one of them had known at Ham, and his follower, M. Fialin de Persigny. So the four talked familiarly all the way to Paris, instead of meditating on the turns of fortune. The Prince, however, was not permitted to remain in Paris, and he returned to England, leaving his cause in the hands of some devoted friends, who succeeded in collecting a strong Napoleonic party, — not a very difficult task, in view of the prodigious influence exerted by the name and memory of the first Emperor. In the summer he was elected to the Assembly by four departments. He declined the election; was then re-elected by these four, and another, and took his seat September 26, 1848. His letters during the interval and his speech on the day of his entrance into the Assembly are well worth reading and pondering. "No one is more resolved to devote himself to the defence of order and the enfranchisement of the Republic than I am. I am not an ambitious man. . . . . I shall always remain faithful to the duties imposed on me by your suffrages and the will of the Assembly. Were I elected President, ... I should devote myself wholly and without reservation to the enfranchisement of a Republic wise in its laws, honest in its intentions, great and strong in its acts."

There were other candidates, but none of any prominence. Lamartine's day was over, and Changarnier's had not yet

come ; " Ledru-Rollin represented the penury rather than the principles of his party ; Raspail was a socialist notable for his frenzy," but otherwise a man of no account. The election took place on the 10th of December. It was a beautiful day, according to Granier de Cassagnac. Every one in France said " The sun of Austerlitz," and villagers walked in procession to the polls, headed by the clergy, even the lame and paralytic joining in, so that a touch of the miraculous was not wanting. It has been said that a million or more of these peasants thought they were voting for the great Emperor, just returned from St. Helena, an illusion that might have been dispelled, one would think, by a schoolmaster or two in the procession ; but the election was a perfectly fair one, and its validity has never been contested. Louis Napoleon was elected by an immense majority. " We are lost," said Marrast, on the night of the election. " He knows the whole power of his name. He knows what he can do, and what he can do he will choose to do." He entered on his duties December 20th, made a neat little speech, was cheered, shook hands with Cavaignac, who, they say, hesitated slightly, and drove off to the Élysée, the palace set apart for the President's occupation. Of those who saw him go in some were far-sighted enough to see that he would leave the Élysée only for the Tuileries.

At the outset the Assembly and the President were perfectly in accord. His first step beyond the boundaries fixed for him was the ordering of the attack on Rome in April, 1849, against the will of the Constituent Assembly. This trespass was covered by a vote of the Legislative Assembly, chosen in May of that year ; but it made a breach between the President and the Republican party that was never healed. The Republicans, however, were the minority in the Chamber of Deputies ; with the majority, who were of monarchical tendencies, the rupture, though slower in coming, was quite as sure. On the 31st May, 1850, the famous Electoral Law was passed, which restricted universal suffrage, by exacting three years' residence in one place. Its effect was to strike from the lists three millions of voters. It has always been said that Louis Napoleon was opposed to this law ; this M. Ténot affirms to be untrue, though he agrees that the breach with the Assembly came soon

after. The perturbation caused by the President's speeches that summer was carried to the highest pitch by the incidents of the great review in October, where the cavalry shouted loudly, "Vive Napoléon! Vive l'Empéreur!" but the infantry defiled in silence, having received orders from their commanding general, Neumayer, to obey the regulation of silence when under arms. For this General Neumayer was deprived of his command, and, though he was restored in a fortnight, even the trusting souls who framed articles forty-eight and sixty-eight must have seen reason for fear.

The President's message of November 12 was, as usual, a skilful imitation of an honest man's words, and the sky brightened for a few days, but was soon clouded over again. General Changarnier, commanding the army in Paris, the bulwark of the Assembly, the one obstacle in the way of a military *coup d'état*, was deprived of his command. The President had exercised a legal right, and the Assembly could do nothing. "The Empire is made," said Thiers in the great debate which followed. The Assembly passed a vote of want of confidence in the ministers. The last time such a vote had been passed was in June, 1830, — an ominous precedent. The new ministers asked for a supplementary credit of 1,800,000 francs, for the President, who had been living beyond his means. It was refused, and he was obliged to sell his horses. It has been stated by a Napoleonic writer that the idea of a *coup d'état* was conceived then (February, 1851).

It was evident that things could not continue as they were, and as the year 1851 wore on they grew worse and worse. The Presidential term expired in 1852, and under the Constitution Louis Napoleon was not re-eligible. No one believed that he would give up the power he held, even had there been another prominent candidate; no one believed that the Constitution could be permanent, or even long-lived; on the whole, the least dangerous step in a night so black seemed to be to revise the Constitution, so as to make his re-election either legal or utterly impossible. The question of a revision was intrusted to a committee comprising De Tocqueville, De Broglie, Montalembert, Favre, Barrot, Baze, Cavaignac, Berryer, and the report, which was written by De Tocqueville himself, was

in favor of revision; but the measure was voted down in the Assembly. After this, nothing could constitutionally be done, and the dread which the thought of the coming elections inspired was so great and so deep as to amount to a panic. Socialism was reported on the increase, and anything seemed better than the dreadful days of June, — days which had been the consequence of socialist teachings.

The Paris elections of 1850 had gone wholly Republican in different shades of red, the reddest of all being Eugène Sue, of romantic memory. Republicanism was gaining ground all over France, and was to some minds as dreadful as socialism, though the Republican leaders in the Assembly were such men as Michel (de Bourges), Jules Favre, Quinet, Cavaignac, Charras, and Victor Hugo. There was little hope that the majority would save society, for, though strongly monarchical, not even its dread of the minority could keep it together, and in 1851 it was in shreds. There was the Legitimist party, headed by Berryer and De Falloux, who prayed for Henry V., and made pious pilgrimages to Ems and Wiesbaden, there to meet the Count de Chambord, and to lay at his feet bouquets of flowers secretly culled in the garden of the Tuileries. There was the Orleanist party, headed by the Duke de Broglie and M. de Montalembert, who wished for a son or grandson of Louis Philippe, and made other pilgrimages, not quite so pious, to Claremont and Brussels. There were the Fusionists, who, counselling a union of the two branches of the house of Bourbon, held meetings and made plans, and were headed by Molé. There was, too, Changarnier, "Cromwell," "Monk," "Sphinx," whom Louis Napoleon had tried and failed to corrupt. He was supposed to have numberless plans and to be ready for any emergency. Then there was Thiers, so cruelly and so cleverly nicknamed Mirabeau-mouche, who buzzed away on the wheel of the state-coach, and who, of course, had a plan. Certainly, society seemed to need salvation, and the Elysées, as the President's friends were called, did their utmost to terrify the perplexed and to perplex the terrified, never ceasing to remark that Providence, with whose designs they professed themselves intimately acquainted, could and would provide a saviour of society, and who should that be but Louis Napoleon Bonaparte?

Rumors of a *coup d'état* were rife during the summer and autumn of 1851, and, according to some Bonapartist writers, one was projected, but postponed for various reasons. On the 17th October the Faucher-Baroche ministry retired, and ten days later their places were filled by men personally devoted to the President. St. Arnaud was made Minister of War, — a most alarming appointment, — and his circular dated October 28 was not soothing. It contained such passages as these: "Under arms, military regulations are the only law. The responsibility of an order rests only with the chief from whom it emanates." It had now become of urgent importance that the army should have a chief on whom France could rely.

The Assembly met on the 4th of November. The President's message was fair in sound as usual, and closed with a formal proposition for the abolition of the law of May 31, and the re-establishment of universal suffrage. This was a bold stroke on his part, for, if the Assembly had acceded to his request and followed the recognized wishes of the people, he would have found himself foiled on the 1st of December. But the royalist majority rejected the proposition, and prepared to secure to themselves the control of the army, who, it was agreed, would follow any leader. With this view, the questors, Baze, Leflô, and De Panat, introduced the celebrated "questors' proposition," which confirmed the existing law, by which the president of the Assembly could call upon the army in case of danger, and disobedience was forbidden. This proposition was moved November 6th, and voted upon November 17th. Of the discussion upon it, which was extremely violent and exciting, M. Ténot gives a brief account, which is well worth reading. St. Arnaud was present, in his scarlet trousers, ready for any emergency; but he left the house before the vote was taken, saying with a laugh and a significant look, "There is too much noise in this house, I am going for the guard." The resolution was rejected by a vote of 408 to 300. They say that, when he heard it, St. Arnaud cried out, "We should have done very well without!" but the President thought differently. The news reached him as he was about to mount his horse. "It is perhaps better so," he said, "and his countenance resumed its serenity."

Perhaps it was better so; the blow was only delayed, and the fortnight that elapsed gave the conspirators time to perfect their plans and put people off their guard. Meanwhile the Assembly were waiting for Louis Napoleon to commit some overt act which should authorize a blow from them; but the secret was perfectly kept. The President's first confidants, counsellors, and, to a great extent, instigators, were MM. de Morny, de Persigny, and Fleury. M. Ténot's biographical sketches of these men are necessarily of the briefest, and there is that to be said about each one of them which will not be said on his tombstone, as also about St. Arnaud, and some of the lesser agents in the scheme.

M. de Morny played by far the most important part of them all; indeed, he has never received his full share of the discredit. He was born in 1811; the *Dictionnaire des Contemporains* does not say anything about his parents, nor about the old gentleman from Mauritius who sold him his name of De Morny and his title of count. He was brought up by Madame de Souza, a charming woman of a peculiarly French type, whose first husband was guillotined, who wrote romances, and, amid all vicissitudes, kept a *salon* until she died, in 1836. She was all that a grandmother should be to the young De Morny, and he probably owed to her those charming manners, which, added to his own personal attraction, made him so successful in society of all kinds. He must always have had more or less distinction of his own, for some one meeting him once in Talleyrand's anteroom, a lad of twelve, going away from a visit to that virtuous prelate, was struck by him, and heard Talleyrand say of him, "That little fellow will be minister some day." At seventeen he was studying theology with all his might, "resolved to get to the bottom of it," he said. Under Louis Philippe, he served in Africa. "Morny goes to Africa," writes the Duke of Orleans, "and all the women are in despair." Probably it was the husbands who were in despair when Morny returned soon after, left the army, and devoted himself to the cultivation of sugar in Southern France. He was elected deputy for his department, and was one of the leading men of the "party of youth" under Louis Philippe, but was less known in 1851 as a politician than as a great speculator and a bril-

liant man of fashion. He was admirably adapted for a state of society where charm counts for more than morality; he had that breadth of interest which belongs to high polish, and which has somewhat the effect of sympathy and unselfishness; he was clever, ready, vigorous enough, lovable, bright, daring, and had that best of habits, the habit of success. When he died, in 1865, some one said, "Perhaps Morny is again in luck." He had always been very intimate with Louis Napoleon, whom he wonderfully resembled in appearance and bearing. In 1849 he said: "All this will end in a *coup d'état*, and I will make the *coup*. When you see me in the ministry, you may say 'Now.'" He was made minister on the night of the 1st of December.

M. de Persigny began life as a non-commissioned officer named Fialin. After a while he remembered that his family had a right to the much finer name of De Persigny, and now all the world remembers it too. About 1831 he became an enthusiastic upholder of Napoleonic ideas, and undertook to propagate them in a journal called *L'Occident*, of which he published one number. This brought him into contact with Louis Napoleon, whose fortunes he ever after followed. He took an active share in the enterprises of Strasbourg and Boulogne, and, as we have seen, returned with the Prince after the Revolution of February. He married Ney's daughter, and became a duke, a senator, and a privy councillor. He does not seem to have counted for as much as the others in the execution of the plot, but he probably did his best, and received his reward.

Colonel Fleury, whose connection with the plot has been overrated by Mr. Kinglake, though his personal influence seems to be underrated by the world, came from a respectable middle-class family of Paris. His youth was very stormy, and, having run through his fortune, he went into the army as a common soldier. He rose rapidly, and his knowledge of horses got him a place on the President's staff. He did his share of the work admirably, and became general, senator, imperial aide-de-camp, and powerful in the imperial stables. Last year he was appointed Envoy to Italy.

Early in 1851, when the *coup d'état* was first in contempla-

tion, it was evident that the great need was officers of high rank on whom the President could rely. He said carelessly one day, "If we were to make generals?" and the idea was caught up and acted on. Colonel Fleury was sent to Algeria to see what he could find, and he found St. Arnaud, who was all they could have wished for a Minister of War; all that he needed was rank, and rank was given him in the war against the Kabyles, which Belouino says was undertaken only for that purpose. Before his departure for the Kabyle expedition, Fleury went to see Véron, then editing the *Constitutionnel*, and said to him, "It would be very agreeable to the President to have General St. Arnaud's rare merits and coming services in Kabylia put in a strong and clear light." So the services which Fleury had foretold were duly trumpeted, and St. Arnaud acquired his rank and was made Minister of War. The rise, however, was a little too rapid, and the man had been rather too bad, as Cavaignac, who had known him well in Africa, remarked at the time. In 1848 he had been nearly massacred by the mob, and he hated the people of Paris with a bitter hatred, which was soon to be gratified. He knew what he had to do, and he was ready and willing to do it. General Magnan, commanding the army in Paris, was not at first let into the secret. He had begged not to be told what was required of him until the last moment; but, after the middle of November, he called together twenty-one of his generals, sounded them by a significant speech, and found they were to be trusted. The police the plotters were sure of through M. de Maupas, who was made prefect October 27. During the last days of November the National Guard was rendered powerless by a trick, and M. de St. Georges, the director of the government printing-office, was bought up. All was now ready for action.

M. Granier de Cassagnac says that on the 1st of December M. de Falloux sent to the President to offer his services in behalf of any *coup d'état* made by the majority. The President said to the messenger, "Let him come to-morrow at ten, and we will talk about it." He came the next day at ten, and thanked the President for saving France.

The 2d of December, the anniversary of the battle of Aus-

terlitz, was the day chosen for the execution of the plot. The night before, the President held his usual reception. Many people were there; among others, the new chief of staff of the National Guard, Colonel Vieyra. The President, who was leaning against a mantel-piece, beckoned to him to approach, and said, in a low voice, "Colonel, are you strong enough to show no signs of emotion in your countenance?" "Prince, I think so." "Very well, it is to be to-night. Can you promise me that the call to arms shall not be beaten to-morrow?" "Yes, Prince, if I have enough men to carry out my orders." "See St. Arnaud. You must sleep to-night at head-quarters." "But, if I were seen spending the night in an arm-chair at head-quarters, people would be astonished." "You are right. Be there at six in the morning: you shall be warned. Let no National Guard go out in uniform. Go. No, not yet, it would look as if I had sent you away." They say that Vieyra prevented any call to arms the next morning by the effectual method of breaking in the drum-heads.

The Prince left the reception-room rather early, as was usual with him, and at eleven every one had gone, except those who remained closeted with him,—Morny, St. Arnaud, Maupas, and the Prince's secretary, Mocquart, who knew of the plot, but took no active part in it. M. de Morny had been at the theatre for a little while. During the *entr'acte* he went into the box of a lady, who said to him, "M. de Morny, they have been saying that the President is going to sweep out the Chamber. What shall you do?" "Madame," he answered, "if there is any sweeping, I shall try to be on the side of the broom."

There were three principal features in the scheme: 1. The nocturnal arrest of all dangerous representatives, especially the generals; 2. The nocturnal occupation of the palace of the Assembly, and the proper distribution of troops through Paris; 3. The printing and publishing of the President's decrees and proclamations."

The last measure was necessarily first undertaken, and about midnight the printing-office was occupied by a company of soldiers. This was the first actual step in the *coup d'état*, and Fleury supervised its execution. M. de Beville, one of the President's aides-de-camp, carried the MSS. (marked

Rubicon, in the Prince's handwriting) to M. de St. Georges, who was expecting them. He also had been at the theatre. Any hesitation on the part of the printers was overcome by a judicious use of two police agents assigned to each printer, and the work was done by four or five o'clock in the morning. During this time Louis Napoleon had written letters, dismissing those of his ministers who were not in his confidence. M. de Morny was made Minister of the Interior.

At some time during these dark hours, before the excitement of the execution of the plot had begun, one of the persons engaged in the enterprise wished to draw back. Perhaps it was the existing state of legislation in France that prevented M. Ténot from mentioning which one of them it was. He says that Colonel Fleury's energetic intervention put a stop to this weakness. What Colonel Fleury did was to shut himself up in a room with the faint-hearted man, show him a pistol, and threaten to blow out his brains if he refused to go on. About half past two the order that General Magnan had asked for was signed. At four St. Arnaud and Maupas were at their posts. The occupation of the palace of the Assembly, the Palais-Bourbon, was a difficult task, as it was protected by a battalion of infantry and one of artillery under Lieutenant-Colonel Niol, whom there had been no attempt to gain over, his character standing too high for that. The questors, Baze and Leflô, who were both capable of resistance, lodged in the palace, so that it was necessary to arrest them and seize the palace suddenly and simultaneously. This task was intrusted to Colonel Espinasse, who accomplished it successfully, under the eyes of M. de Persigny. The questors were taken in bed, both resisting, but uselessly. The arrests of other prominent men were going on at the same time ; the stories are all very much alike, — resistance and indignation on one side, odious violence on the other. Changarnier's arrest was considered the most important, and was effected by two officers, fifteen policemen, and forty soldiers. Changarnier must have thought with some bitterness of his words of the preceding June: "They could not bring against the Assembly a battalion, nor a company, nor a squad of our soldiers!" Lamoricière was found in bed and asleep, as most well-conducted persons would be at

four in the morning. His servant called "Robbers," and was bayoneted into silence. At first the General kept silence; then he said to the servant, "Where is the money I put on this mantel-piece?" "It is safe." "Give me my coat." "Sir," said the police agent, "what you have just said is an insult to me." "How do I know that you are not felons?" answered the General, coolly. On his way to prison he attempted to harangue the soldiers from the carriage window, but the policeman pulled a gag from his pocket and threatened to use it if he uttered a single word more. He was taken to Mazas, like the others, in all sixteen representatives, and from sixty to seventy-eight citizens. The affair was over by six or half past six o'clock in the morning. All that the police had been directed to do they had done. All that the army had been directed to do it had done. One officer, indeed, had broken his sword and thrown it at Colonel Espinasse's feet, but this was the one exception to the rule of implicit obedience. M. de Morny was in possession of the Ministry of the Interior, and had telegraphed to the departments. There had been no failure, no accident, no break in the net. The *coup d'état* was complete.

By seven o'clock on the morning of the day of Austerlitz the workmen were stopping on their way to work, and collecting in little groups around the placards on the walls. There were four proclamations, — one to the inhabitants of Paris, signed Maupas; one to the French army, and another to the French people, signed by Louis Napoleon; and the fourth, "in the name of the French people," was signed by Louis Napoleon and countersigned by Morny. There were three points made in these proclamations: 1. That universal suffrage was established; 2. That the *coup d'état* was rendered necessary by the plots of the royalist majority, who were conspiring against the Republic; 3. That the President's one object was to maintain the Republic and to save society. The newspapers had been suppressed, the knowledge of the events of the night was at first scanty, and the lower classes, having their votes once more, were pleased in the beginning. The *bourgeoisie* was distressed and perturbed, and a great legitimist said, "The red would be better than what is coming." No one was allowed to enter the Assembly-room, and some representatives who got

in by a side door were driven out. The majority held a meeting at the Mairie of the tenth arrondissement, at which every shade of opinion was represented. As it was perfect in its organization, it passed a decree, under article sixty-eight, depriving the President of his authority. This decree was signed by two hundred and thirty representatives, including Odilon Barrot, De Beaumont, Berryer, De Broglie, Daru, now Minister of Foreign Affairs, and main-stay of the present Liberal Cabinet, Dufaure, Duvergier de Hauranne, De Falloux, Kératry, the father of the house, Laboulaye, Oscar de Lafayette, Jules de Lasteyrie, Oudinot, Rémusat, Sue, and De Tocqueville.* After a session of some hours they were arrested, carried off to a barrack-room on the Quai d'Orsay, and thence transferred that night or the next morning to different prisons in or near Paris. Morny said that he had them arrested to save them from their own courage; and it is not easy to understand why they wasted their time in talking instead of attempting action. Some other representatives came and joined them in prison. There was difficulty about admitting M. Valette. "Nevertheless," he said, "I have two claims to be admitted to-day: I am a representative of the people and a professor of law." Nor was that the only stab given by an epigram. As the Duke de Montebello was getting into the van to be carried off to Mont-Valérien, he recognized Colonel Feray, the officer commanding the escort. "Gentlemen," he said, "this is the anniversary of the battle of Austerlitz, and there is the son-in-law of Marshal Bugeaud putting the son of Marshal Lannes into a prison-van."

There were other incidents during the day, but none of importance. The High Court of Cassation met, by the mouths of five judges decided that there was cause to proceed under the Constitution, and adjourned; met again, decided that there were obstacles in the way of their mandate, and adjourned again. As they soon after took the oath of allegiance to the Prince President, they probably concluded that the obstacles were insurmountable. In the morning the President took a ride and was received without enthusiasm, but without

* In the London Times of December 11 there is a letter from M. de Tocqueville giving a detailed account of this meeting. The letter has been reprinted with the translation of his Life.

hostility. There were some shouts of *Vive la République*, and a few cheers for the Constitution, but the crowd was cold, and the President rode back to his palace and did not show himself again until all was over. When the sun of Austerlitz, which some of us wish had never risen, set that night, the sky was cloudy.

The next morning was dark and rainy, the shops were slow to open, the streets were deserted. Everything looked like an outbreak, and an outbreak came. About nine o'clock on the morning of the 3d the Faubourg St. Antoine was barricaded by about forty men, all Republicans of the better class, some representatives, whose only hope was that the sight of blood — their own blood — would rouse the people from their lethargy. Among these forty were Jules Bastide, Schoelcher, Esquiros, Madier de Montjau, and Baudin, so soon to be the chief figure in the scene. He was one of eight who were standing on the barricade as the soldiers came up; they made a sign to the soldiers to stop, but the line swept on. Some of the representatives then came down from the barricade and advanced to meet the troop, who halted instinctively. There were appeals made in the name of the Constitution, to which the soldiers did not listen, but still they did not fire, until one of the representatives remaining on the barricade mistook the situation and fired at the column, who replied by a general discharge. Baudin fell dead. A young workman by his side was mortally wounded.

Baudin's last moments had been saddened by the following incident. Some minutes before the troops came up, he appealed to a group of workmen, one of whom answered, "Do you think that we are going to have ourselves killed that you may keep your twenty-five francs a day?" (This was the daily pay of a representative.) "Stay where you are a minute, my friend," Baudin answered with a bitter smile, "and you shall see how a man dies for twenty-five francs?"

His blood was not wholly wasted. The news soon spread; other barricades were made, and signs of resistance showed themselves all over Paris. Placards calling to arms were posted, read, and acted on. The barricades were numerous and strong; and the agitation was extreme from the Boulevard Mont-

martre to the Chaussée d'Antin, a quarter rarely in sympathy with revolutionary movements. There was a good deal of fighting all over Paris that afternoon, and during the night of the 3d the Republicans were hopeful. The next morning everything was as they wished it. St. Arnaud had placarded the walls with proclamations forbidding men to collect in crowds or groups, forbidding reading aloud in the streets, and threatening instant death to any one taken with arms in his hands. Consequently immense crowds of workmen were gathered round the Republican placards, listening to loud reading and talking to armed men. "Paris is off," said a veteran in revolutions. "Let a regiment hesitate or a legion leave, and Louis Napoleon is lost!" cried Jules Favre. M. de Maupas was frightened out of his wicked wits. The publication of a part of the correspondence between him and Morny is one of Dr. Véron's indiscretions, for which we cannot be too grateful. It shows Maupas writing on the morning of the 4th to the Minister of the Interior: "Barricades in the Rue Dauphiné. I am surrounded. Tell General Sanboul. I am without force." Again: "Gatherings on the Pont Neuf; firing on the Quai aux Fleurs; compact crowds near the Prefecture of Police. They are firing through a grating. What shall I do?" Morny's reply was: "Answer by firing through your grating." Again Maupas writes to Morny: "They say that the 12th Dragoons have come from St. Germain with the Count de Chambord in their ranks as a soldier. I hardly believe it." To this Morny replied: "And I don't believe it at all." How many men had it taken to terrify M. de Maupas after this fashion? Twenty or thirty young fellows from the Latin Quarter, great was whose surprise when, years after, they found how terrific they had been.

Certainly Maupas was not the most valiant of men; but others were frightened too. Morny, who had gone out to see for himself, came back to find his followers pale and uncertain. Nothing, however, disconcerted that man of silk and steel. "What," he said gayly, "yesterday you wished barricades, now you have got them and you are not satisfied." He, however, was satisfied. He had seen more than one revolution, and he did not mean that the Three Days of December should be quoted with the Three Days of February and the Three

Days of July. On the night of the 3d, at a military council at which were present St. Arnaud, Magnan, the leading generals of division, and perhaps the President, Morny laid down his plan of campaign, which he afterwards, with great difficulty but with perfect success, saw executed. It was this: to concentrate the troops in masses, take care of them, feed them well, and keep them away from the people; to suppress small posts; to abstain from patrols, to permit the construction of barricades. Then, carefully choosing the time for action, to attack these suddenly with compact forces and crush out all resistance.

About one o'clock on the 4th the time for action, according to M. de Morny's plan, had come. The soldiers, who had been kept free from fatigue for two days, and had been given enough — much more than enough — of meat and wine and rest, were brought into action between one and two o'clock. Morny's order was, "Strike hard on the Boulevard," — an order fully executed by a sudden cannonade of shot and shell poured upon an unoffending crowd of men, women, and children, shopkeepers, servants, travellers, who crowded the sidewalks and windows to see the soldiers, who now filled the Boulevard from the extremity of the Boulevard Bonne Nouvelle to the Boulevard des Italiens. The barricades throughout the city were carried, after more or less fighting at each. Men taken with arms in their hands or fingers blackened with powder were shot; a woman carrying twenty-five daggers was arrested and shot; a gardener, with a weapon under his blouse, was shot and thrown into the Seine, though he lived to protest that his carbine was out of order; a child of seven was shot; nine men were shot "in their own houses." There is no use in multiplying these details. They prove the resistance of the people; they prove "the benignity of the son of Hortense"; they also prove the vigor and skill of M. de Morny. His plan was a complete success. Through the afternoon of the 4th the bodies of the dead lay in their blood along the streets. The morning of the 5th showed that the spirit of resistance was broken. The people of Paris were in a stupor of horror, and few dared to leave their houses. "Never in the memory of man," says the *Moniteur*, "have the streets worn so sombre

an aspect." That day, and the next and the next, the dead — at least three hundred and eighty citizens and twenty-seven soldiers — were buried, in the sight of sullen, silent crowds. On the 5th Louis Napoleon's triumph was assured; on the 8th he declared that order was restored. The *coup* was complete.

There was work still to do, but not such bloody work. Almost all the members of the majority were let out of prison on the 6th and 7th; but other arrests were made by the thousand, from all ranks of life, — "a coat for every blouse," a statement which is as exact as an epigram can well be. They were all Republicans and received different punishments, generally exile or transportation. Some of them have come back and done good service in the Opposition. Some of them, who did not choose to return, find it hard to live and hard to die across the French frontier, but they too have done good service.

With the subsequent history of the leading men who took part on either side on the 2d December M. Ténot does not meddle. Most of them went out of politics and into literature; some, like Montalembert and Baroche, were led to believe that they must support Louis Napoleon or endless anarchy. Here it may be said, "And what of the long list of honorable men who belonged to the Consultative Commission?" But how do we know who did belong to it? The list was published December 3d, and Léon Faucher's name was on it; his indignant letter of remonstrance produced some effect; but Joseph Perier's remonstrances had none, and he was seen frantically tearing his name from the posted lists and calling the bystanders to witness that it was a lie. Count Beugnot, rumor says, resorted to the expedient of leaving his cards inscribed "Ex-representative, not member of the Consultative Commission"; and the Duke d'Albuféra went in person to M. de Morny to protest against the use of his name. It is said that Morny answered, "Sir, we needed your name, and we took it; as for your person, we have nothing to do with that; only I invite you to keep yourself quiet." It is hard when the son of a man like Suchet must take an answer like this from a man who bought a name and borrowed a grandmother.

On the 20th of December Louis Napoleon was absolved

from all his sins of the 2d by the vote of the people in his behalf. The next year he became Emperor.

That is the story of the *coup d'état*, and a very ugly story it is. M. Ténot has secured for himself the place of the real historian of the Second of December; and at the same time his book has had all the success of a sensation novel. Three editions in a fortnight are more than most inventors of murders aspire to; and the speeches and excitement over Baudin's grave, and the subsequent trials and fines, proved how thoroughly the French had read and digested the book. The censorship could not meddle with it, for it is a book without an adjective; but the new generation to whom the book was addressed have had a full answer to their question, "How came this ruler here?"

Agnes Irwin.

Art. VIII. — The Prospects of the Political Art.

In the literature of politics there is perhaps no word which meets the eye so often as the word "liberty," and there is no nobler word in it. There is certainly none about which so many touching associations cluster. We never speak of it without calling up a thousand memories of disasters and triumphs which are among the greatest glories of the human race. The Old Cause, as Sidney called it on the scaffold, has, like religion, its saints and martyrs and legends; and there is, perhaps, nothing, except religion, for which men have done and endured so much. Nearly all the great revolutions which form the stages in human progress were accomplished in its name, and so strong is the hold it has secured in the popular imagination, that we always speak of it as the highest political good. A people which has it is commonly believed to have all; a people which has it not, to have less than nothing.

And yet, when we come to inquire what this liberty is which has, for so many thousand years, kept the world in a blaze, we find it is in itself rather an ideal than a tangible good; that the long struggle for it has been rather an energetic vin-

dication of human dignity and independence than the pursuit of solid happiness. It is rather a means than an end; rather something which may be made an instrument of human culture, or indeed a condition of human culture in the highest sense, than a satisfaction of human aspirations. For it does not satisfy. The peoples who have had it have been in all ages the least content, the most restless, the most eager in pursuit of something beyond liberty, of which liberty was but the promise or foretaste.

In fact, the liberty of which we hear and read so much, — and of course it is what is commonly called civil liberty we have here in mind, — for which so many orators have thundered and patriots bled, has never been this or that kind of government; what its defenders have sought has been, not so much that men's relations in society should be regulated in a particular way, as that the power of government, or the sovereignty, as it is called, should be lodged in a particular place. The political history of the civilized world is made up almost exclusively of disputes about the seat of the sovereignty. Nearly all the troubles of the ancient republics were contests about the manner in which this authority should be distributed, and about the conditions under which it should be exercised. When we speak of any of them as having fallen, what we mean is simply that the power passed from the many to the few, or to one. Mediæval history is made up in much the same way. The earlier part of it exhibits the sovereignty exercised by a large number of small potentates; the latter part of it, the gradual absorption of the sovereignty by a few great monarchs. And the long struggle for constitutional government in Europe, which is only closing before our eyes at this moment, has been in the main an effort on the part of the people to secure a share in the sovereignty for themselves. When we talk of political progress, what we generally mean by it is the gradual success of the people in securing either wholly or in great part the substitution of their will for somebody else's will in the direction of national affairs. We do not always or necessarily mean that they are securing a better administration of the national affairs, or more security for life or property at home, or more dignity or influence abroad. Indeed, I cannot better illustrate the distinction than by saying that the two most important political revolu-

tions of the modern world, that of 1640 in England and that of 1776 in America, arose out of a controversy about a tax; but the question in dispute was, not whether the tax was a good or bad one, but whether the king or the people had the right to levy it.

All this, doubtless, sounds familiar enough. I go over it simply to bring out a little more clearly the fact that the civilized world has been, down to our day, occupied so incessantly with the task of fixing the form of the government, that not only has the form of the government come to be popularly regarded as the great end for which states exist, but that very little progress has been made in the *art* of government. The question how to secure liberty, that is, how to secure a share in the sovereignty for the many, has occupied the race so constantly since the dawn of history, that very little attention has hitherto been bestowed on that greatest of all political questions, the use which we should make of liberty after we have got it. Sovereignty is, after all, only a means; the end for which political societies exist is right living, and not any particular distribution of the supreme power; and the sole claim of civil liberty on human affection and admiration lies in the fact that under it human faculties are found to have freest play, human energies most force, and human aspirations the widest and loftiest range.

Of course this struggle could not go on for so many hundred years without being accompanied, through the mere growth of civilization, by a great many reforms in legislation; but the reforms in legislation were not its final or main object. Had they been, the movement towards democracy might have been arrested at any given time, or in any given place, by the establishment of a paternal despotism or of an enlightened oligarchy. The father of the late Grand Duke of Tuscany, or the Bernese or Venetian patricians, might fairly have said that they did for the people as much as the people were at all likely to do for themselves. It has indeed been a favorite conservative fancy in all ages that the mouths of political agitators might be stopped by the provision of peace and plenty, justice and security, for the many by a ruling and enlightened few. Occasionally it has seemed as if this vision

were going to be realized, but the illusion has never lasted long. The liberal movement, as it is called, has been unsteady, but it has been continuous; it has often been imperceptible for brief periods, but it has never ceased. All compromise has been found impossible, and we are now on the point of seeing it close all over the civilized world, by the reference of every great question of national concern to universal suffrage, — which is simply a name for the widest possible distribution of the sovereignty.

Considering how severe the struggle has been, and how largely wealth, power of organization, and religion have been on the side of privilege, it is hardly wonderful that it should have lasted so long, or that it should have resulted in so few contributions to the science of government. Indeed, when we come to review the stock of political ideas, and the political mechanism now in our possession, and compare them with those bequeathed by the Roman Empire to the modern world, we have reason to be astonished, if not ashamed, of the smallness and insignificance of the additions we have made to the legacy. To the mechanism of government we have really added nothing but the representative system, an admirable contrivance, it is true, which has made possible in the modern world what was not possible in the ancient world, — a large democratic state. In the government of municipalities, as we received it from the ancients, we cannot be said to have made any improvements, except such as the advance in the physical sciences have forced upon us, — such as improved means of lighting and ventilation and locomotion. In provision for popular cleanliness and recreation, and in sewerage, our cities are inferior to the Roman cities. We have, it is true, discovered in popular education one preventive of crime, of which the ancient world knew nothing; but then, although we understand the laws of political economy, which the Romans did not, and honor labor, which they did not, and have got rid of slavery, which dragged their empire down, we find the government of our great cities just as serious a problem as Julius Cæsar found it. Before such a state of things as presents itself in New York and Chicago to-day, modern democracy stands nearly as helpless as the oligarchy stood before the

Roman mob in the last days of the Republic. To the art of rapidly civilizing and assimilating populations in a lower social condition, which the Romans possessed in so high a degree, and of which no satisfactory explanation, I think, has ever been offered, the modern world can certainly lay no claim. It is, indeed, only in our day and on this continent that the experiment has been renewed with any degree of success, though some very remarkable results begin at last to be attained by the English in India; and yet it is not made here without considerable loss to the higher influence in the process, far greater, there is reason to believe, than Rome suffered in bringing the Gaul or Iberian or Briton up to her own level.

As regards the administration of justice, including under that term the whole of the machinery by which rights and duties are defined and enforced, we have certainly contributed little to the work of our judicial ancestors. The Roman law has been for ages, and still is to modern jurists, what the Colliseum was to mediæval builders, — a great quarry from which the materials of all other systems have been drawn in rich abundance; and to this day there is no civilized country in which it is not resorted to for guidance in those nicer applications of morality for which the increasing complication of human affairs is constantly calling. We have, it is true, made a great and beneficent contribution to civilization in our system of international law, but the very foundations of this we have drawn from Roman jurisprudence. The Romans could not construct it as long as their empire included the civilized world, since international law arose out of the existence of a large number of equal and independent states. Political economy, too, is the work of the modern world. The Romans knew nothing of it, and their ignorance eventually proved fatal to the empire; but then for the construction of this science, which has already exercised so marked an influence on the government of modern states, a wide field of observation and a long and rich experience were absolutely necessary, and these the ancients did not possess. If we take up Adam Smith, the father of the science, and examine closely the materials from which his conclusions are drawn, we shall find that it has taken the social and political life of many nations and many

ages to furnish them. Political economy was, in short, in its beginnings, and must largely remain till the end, the product of observation, and for fruitful observation length of time and wideness of field are absolutely essential. It must be confessed, too, that in no country in the modern world is the machinery for the exposition and application of the law nearly so perfect as that which the Romans possessed for several centuries. No modern nation has managed to retain in its bar the intellectual *élite* of its population, as the Romans did, and secure from its foremost men that assiduous, acute, and singularly practical cultivation of legal science which made Roman jurisprudence one of the noblest products of the human understanding.

Our superiority to the ancients in the clearness and tenacity with which we hold certain humanitarian ideas is unquestionable, but then we have struck out few or no fresh ones. The idea of the brotherhood of man is older than modern civilization. Its practical application in the Roman Empire was prevented even in Christian times by the constitution of the state, which rested on conquest and slavery. But then we have had it in our charge for full twelve hundred years, and it is only in the present day that it can be said to be making its way into politics and exercising a marked influence on legislation, although during the greater part of that period there have been half a dozen states in which the experiment might have been tried, and during the whole of it we have had a great ecclesiastical organization expressly devoted to the duty of preaching it. The family has in our hands undergone some amelioration. Women and children occupy a better footing among us than they did in the ancient world, but owing rather to the softening of manners than to improvements in positive law.

Of course, in instituting these comparisons, I do not mean to assert that the state of society now is not greatly superior to anything that was known in the ancient world. In personal purity and practical humanity particularly, our superiority is known to all readers of history, and modern society is a free society. What I mean to say is, that the improvement in the condition of society has not been the consequence of, and has not shown itself, or has shown itself only faintly, in, legislation.

In fact, the stream of social progress may be said to have run separate from that of legal progress. Nations have been, on the whole, better than their laws. If, for example, we were to have judged of the manners of any European people, down to the close of the last century, by its criminal code, we should have concluded it to be far more brutal than it really was. Or if we had judged of the state of religion by the legal relations of the Church to society, we should have concluded that religion had no influence on men's lives at all, or only a degrading one.

When we come to inquire how it is that the art of government has not kept pace with the other arts, how it is that society has made more rapid progress than legislation, that in the field of statesmanship the modern world has achieved so much less than in the field of natural science, we find ourselves face to face with a somewhat complicated problem. Considering the amount of attention politics have always absorbed, how deeply interested every human being is in the proper regulation of his relations with his fellows, it does at first sight seem very wonderful that as soon as the proper scientific method was discovered, and the scientific spirit began to grow, human society did not form one of the earliest objects of its application; that observation and experiment, collection of facts and comparison and induction, did not play in legislation as large a part as they played in the physical sciences; that, in short, the much-talked-of study of mankind should have exercised so little influence on the lawgiver. It must not be supposed that it is democracy only which has discovered anything good in the people. There has, it is safe to say, never been a system of government which did not rest on the assumption that those who lived under it loved good rather than evil, and desired justice to be done. The worst tyrants have counted, or affected to count, on the attachment of the great body of their subjects. In all that we read of the kings being a terror to evil-doers, and of the magistrates not bearing the sword in vain, it is taken for granted that the evil-doers were but a small minority, and that the bulk of every community rejoiced when the sword fell. The happiness of his people, too, has always been set forth as the main object of a wise ruler's care, and a

knowledge of his people a requisite for the proper discharge of his duties. Nevertheless, the idea that the legislators were bound to adapt their legislation to the people, that popular wants, wishes, and weaknesses should form the basis of it, and that, in short, the inductive method should be used in the work of government, seems not to have been recognized or acted on till the present century. Bacon, strange to say, after showing the applicability of his new philosophic method to everything else, stopped short when he came to politics, and announced that with regard to this "he preferred to be silent." Elsewhere he speaks of government as a mystery into which the governed should not pry, although in treating of the laws he shows that the usefulness of his philosophy in politics ran in his mind.

The most powerful hindrance to scientific legislation has been one of the great sources of law,—custom. "There is," as the poet says,

> "a sanctifying power in years;
> What age has rendered gray appears divine."

The tendency in human nature to contract habits, that is, to find not only the difficulty of doing a thing decrease the oftener one does it, but to find pleasure in doing it because one has often done it, probably does more to smooth the path of life for us than any other feature of our mental constitution. It takes the sting out of the hardest lot, and often converts what at first were real misfortunes into sweeteners of our existence. It spares everybody half the wear and tear of the world, by enabling him to do a large part of his work without having to call on the will for a separate effort for each act; and it makes and has always made some of the hardest social yokes sit so lightly as scarcely to be felt at all.

Now habit, or custom, as it is more generally called, has always played in politics a part even more important than it has played in private life. Its influence on the career of nations has been just as strong and far-reaching as its influence on the career of individuals. Until the world has reached a stage of culture from which it is yet far indeed, we may be sure all political systems will largely rest on it. All governments may be said, down almost to our own day, to have rested on it.

"Hast thou well considered," says Carlyle, "all that habit

does in this life of ours; how all knowledge and all practice hang wondrous over infinite abysses of the unknown, impracticable; and our whole being is an infinite abyss, overarched by habit, as by a thin earth-rind, laboriously built together?

"But if every *man* holds confined within him a mad man, what must every *society* do, — society which, in its commonest state, is called the standing miracle of this world? Without such earth-rind of habit, call it system of habits, in a word, fixed ways of acting and of believing, — society would not exist at all. With such it exists, better or worse. Herein, too, in this its system of habits, acquired, retained how you will, lies the true law code and constitution of a society; the only code, though an unwritten one, which it can in no wise disobey. The thing we call written code, constitution, form of government, and the like, what is it but some miniature image, and solemnly expressed summary of this unwritten code?"

Now custom opposes itself to change, and even change for the better, in several ways. First of all it makes it *difficult*, even when the existing state of things is thoroughly rotten. Then it gives the established order a character of sanctity; in other words, it makes change seem impious; and last of all, it makes it seem dangerous and inexpedient. One of the most striking illustrations of its power in giving the established order of things a sacred character is the growth in modern Europe of the doctrine of the divine right of kings, as it used to be called, or of legitimacy, as it is now called, under cover of which ruthless military conquerors grew in the full light of day, and before people's eyes, into the Lord's anointed, the dispensers on earth of his mercy and justice. In fastening on all things new the mark of danger, custom has had at its back, too, that most ancient of all political beliefs, that the golden age was in the past, which was simply a poetic way of expressing the idea that all change meant decline, that the more men differed from their ancestors in their ways of thinking and acting the worse they were. As far as politics was concerned, Christianity did little or nothing to dispel this belief. For the first thousand years of its existence the Church treated the condition of the world as hopeless, and taught the believers — that is, the only portion of society which was troubled by its

evils, and was willing to labor for reform — to expect no improvement on this side of the grave. Mortal eyes were not to behold the promised land, and he was the wisest man who placed least value on the things of this life.

The golden age was transferred to the future, hope began to exert a marked influence on politics, and a belief in the perfectibility of human society, or at least in its capability of indefinite growth, began to gain ground, and give vigor to reformatory effort, only after long-continued observation of the fact that, in spite of its badness, society *did* improve, and improve steadily. The rapid advance of discovery and invention, too, after the introduction of the new scientific method, kindled expectation to an extraordinary degree with regard to the social future, especially after the influence of scientific research on men's material condition began to be fairly perceived; so that in the sixteenth century men began to look for the kingdom of God on earth, and look on the world as a sphere worthy of men's highest powers. But the spread of this faith was naturally slow, and it is only within the present century that we have ceased to hear "the wisdom of our ancestors" used as one of the standing arguments against political or social change. Nothing could better illustrate, indeed, the fast hold the old doctrine had taken on the human mind than the importance which one constantly finds attached in political literature, as if it were a striking discovery, to Bacon's observation, "Antiquitas sæculi juventus mundi," — that what we call antiquity, in point of time was in reality the youth of the world, — its age of ignorance and inexperience.

Perhaps nothing has formed a greater obstacle to the growth of scientific legislation, however, than ignorance of human nature. Human nature, it has to be remembered, is the main element in all social and political problems, — human nature as it is, and not as it ought to be, or as we should like to see it, — a proposition which seems simple and commonplace enough, as I here state it, but which has, nevertheless, been ignored or forgotten in nine out of ten of all the schemes of reform ever set on foot. The consequence of this non-recognition or forgetfulness is that we constantly hear the failure of governments, and of plans for the regeneration of mankind, accounted

for by the fact that some body of persons who ought to have been public-spirited were selfish; others who ought to have been wise were foolish; others who ought to have been industrious were lazy; and others, again, who ought to have lived at home peaceably, went about robbing and murdering. Now this is very much as if a chemist should tell us of the wonderful results he would accomplish, the valuable contributions he would make to the arts, if it were not for the fact that bodies would only combine in certain proportions, or if the action of heat did not expand or that of cold contract. The weaknesses of men, their follies, vices, passions, prejudices, are for the purposes of the statesman or social philosopher essential parts of all questions of government. He cannot eliminate them: he must deal with them; and if his schemes fail on account of their existence, his failure is just as complete, and almost as inexcusable, as if they did *not* exist.

Now there is one very striking and very mysterious quality in human nature which does a good deal to complicate all political problems, and that is, that in men in masses this nature is very different in many respects from what it is in individual men. Individuals, in short, are greatly changed when they are combined into great bodies. Motives act on them with different degrees of force; considerations which weigh powerfully with a man in his own home weigh very little with him when he is at a public meeting, or marching in a procession, or in the ranks of an army. We are forced to admit, too, however firmly we believe in the freedom of the individual will, or however thoroughly convinced we may be of its control over the career of the individual, that as a member of society, he lives under a different law, and that on the destiny of society his free will, as far as we can see, exerts but little influence. *How* this is, or why this is, at what point the action of the individual's freedom ends, and that of the laws of the social organism begins, are questions on which I do not purpose entering here. They are parts of that great controversy about liberty and necessity which began when man first began to study his own nature, and will probably last as long as the race lasts, but which has derived fresh heat of late from the attempts which have been making to construct a sci-

ence of society. Even if we admit, however, that no such attempt will ever be completely successful, there is no denying that some very important contributions towards it have been made by close observation of social phenomena, and that even if we have not discovered the laws of society so as to be able to predict accurately the course of human affairs, we have discovered certain *tendencies* of society with sufficient accuracy to form in many fields an excellent basis for legislation. Take as an illustration of this the advance that has been made in the means of securing discipline in the army and in prisons. It was held for centuries, and held with perfect honesty, that to obtain obedience from men in an abnormal state of restraint fear inspired by terrible penalties and constant repression were the only instruments of any efficacy. This theory has now been almost totally abandoned in practice, as the result of observation and experiment, and now as much reliance is reposed on appeals to men's self-respect, by mere disciplinarians as by philanthropists.

For the discovery of social tendencies, however, for purposes of legislation, wide observation of phenomena and the industrious and careful collection of materials are absolutely necessary. But no such processes were carried on down to a very recent period, for two reasons: the first was, that nobody thought them necessary; the second, that the machinery for collecting them did not exist. Europe emerged from the Middle Ages with an ideal of the state, in which human nature appeared as a thing to be curbed and subdued, and not a thing to be accommodated or trained. In this ideal, too, the king derived his authority directly from God, and was responsible only to God for its exercise. The nobility also were of divine ordinance, and were intended to be an ornament and bulwark for the throne, and a guide and director for the common people. The state itself was to be first of all united thoroughly under one faith, one king, and one law. It was to be self-supporting, to produce within its own borders everything necessary for its sustenance in peace and its defence in war. Foreign commerce, and, indeed, all intercourse with foreigners, was an evil to be kept within as narrow limits as possible. War was not an evil; even Bacon declared it to be to the body politic

what exercise was to the human body. The king was the father of his people; he prescribed their belief, the employments in which they should engage, the manner in which they should invest their capital, nay, sometimes even the material of their clothing. The authority to do this came to him from on high, and his ideal of the state came to him partly from tradition, partly from the Church. In this ideal, of course, justice and security had a high place; but of the means of promoting them he was sole judge. If his plans miscarried, it was ascribed either to popular perversity or the Divine wrath. If to popular perversity, the sanctions of the law were made more terrible, heavier punishments were prescribed; if to the Divine wrath, prayers, fastings, and offerings were resorted to.

In a system of this kind statistics were of no use, and accordingly none existed, and would hardly have existed, even if the machinery for collecting them had been attainable. How far, indeed, the idea of experimental politics was from the minds of the men of all parties, and has continued to be almost down to our day, was well illustrated in some of the leading attempts at reform. Few men entered on the work of reform in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries with the idea simply of extirpating abuses. They generally had in their heads before they moved at all an entirely fresh ideal of either Church or State, which they sought to substitute for the old one, but without mixture or compromise. Their objection to the old order of things was not simply that it failed to answer its purpose, but that it occupied the ground on which their own heavenly city was to stand.

But even if there had been any general desire to arrive at political conclusions under the guidance of experiment and observation, the administrative machinery in every country was too defective for the collection of accurate or trustworthy statistics. Very little, therefore, was or could be known by any government of the numbers, resources, tastes, habits, tendencies, or progressions of its subjects. Great and striking evils were indeed met by legislation; but as to the effect of the law, there generally prevailed as much ignorance as indifference. Provinces were remote; distances, measured by time, were enormous. The civil service was in the rudest condition; the art of col-

lecting and arranging figures was unknown, or barely known, — at least no skill in it had been attained. Nearly all political writing, therefore, was purely speculative. The argument started from a series of assumptions, resting largely on ancient history or biography, and ended in a kind of poet's dream. The preambles to edicts or acts of Parliament, which for ages contained the only reasons for a law which the people was permitted to receive, were, in nine cases out of ten, statements of moral maxims or religious dogmas. Men were directed to do this or avoid that in the general interest of virtue, or for the honor of God. And it is no less singular than true, that attempts to make law conterminous with morality, to enforce legally the practice of private virtues or the performance of religious duties, have been marks of a declining and rudimentary condition of the political art. One of the most curious features in the history of the Roman law is, that as the empire decayed, the jurists fell off in learning and acuteness, and the bonds of social and political morality became relaxed, the attempts to enforce the performance of self-regarding duties by legislation, and to make religion the formal basis of politics, became more and more frequent.

The legislator who, before passing a law, consults simply his own view of fitness, or abstract moral rules, or religious ideas, or philosophic laws, and when he finds his laws hard to enforce simply increases the penalty which sanctions them, belongs to the old school. He who, before he passes a law, asks, Can I enforce it? what effects is it likely to produce besides the one I have directly in view? what does human experience tell us as to the working of similar measures? what difficulties does my own knowledge of human nature suggest that it is likely to meet with? — he who asks these questions belongs to the new school. The gulf between them is nearly as wide as that which separated the alchemist from the chemist. The principle once established, that the impracticability of a measure is the strongest objection that can be made to it, — that, in short, the value of legislation depends, for the most part, and under most circumstances, on the ease with which it can be put into execution and on the nature of the effects which follow it, and we open up an entirely new field in politics and give a new character to our civilization. We initiate a revolution in the art of

government, and one that promises results no less fruitful for human happiness than those produced by the application of the experimental method to other sciences. In fact, we for the first time apply the laws of the human understanding to that "great problem of man," as the German historian calls it, — "how to live in conscious harmony with himself, with his neighbor, and with the whole to which he belongs."

It may safely be taken for granted that the conflict about the form of government being now over, and democracy having remained, and being almost certain to remain, during the remainder of the present cycle of civilization, master of the field, we shall now witness a period of extraordinary activity, both in the collection of facts and of generalizations from them for political purposes. The governmental machinery in all civilized countries has been brought to a high degree of perfection; the accumulation of statistics has become easy, and great skill has been attained in the arrangement and collation of them. Thousands of trained observers are engaged in noting with minuteness every phenomenon of society. Every year witnesses immense additions to the store of our knowledge with regard to human wants, weaknesses, desires, and tendencies, as displayed in trading, travelling, manufacturing, marrying, educating, governing, obeying, fighting, eating, drinking, and even pleasure-hunting. There is hardly an act of our lives that we do not perform under the inspection of a social philosopher or a curious traveller, of a revenue commissioner or a legislative committee. The materials for political deductions already form a huge mass, and they increase from year to year with growing rapidity, under the influence of the process of assimilation now going on among all civilized states.

This assimilation may be said to be both unconscious and conscious. By unconscious assimilation I mean that which is the indirect effect of greater security and improvement in the means of locomotion, the growth of intercourse between the inhabitants of different countries, and the increasing familiarity of every people with foreign literature through the spread of education. The enormous demands on the resources of authors made by the reading public of our day, and especially in the field of light literature, forces authors to search for

their materials over an ever-widening field. There is hardly a phase of the social life of any country in Christendom with which novel-readers, for instance, are not now familiarized, through the plots and illustrations of their favorite writers. Moreover, the isolation in all fields of thought under which nearly all that is distinctively national in ideas and expression has grown up may be said to be no longer within our reach. The man who in any field of intellectual labor takes pains to protect himself from foreign impressions by complete seclusion runs imminent risk, when he reappears in the world with his finished work, of finding his finest thoughts in last year's gift-books, and his discoveries not only anticipated, but grown stale. Indeed, no matter what literary product is now presented to us, we find it difficult to say in what proportion any country or age has contributed to its growth. Of the effect of this growing community of ideas on manners I need hardly speak. Combined with travel, and the minute attention paid to foreign affairs by the newspapers, it is producing a sameness of type in many ways of thinking and of acting all over the world, which social and political philosophers — and not without some very good reasons — deeply deplore, but which, nevertheless, seems necessary to the realization of the social ideal which the modern world has set before itself as the goal of its striving.

By conscious assimilation I mean the effort, which has only shown itself markedly within the present century, but which every nation is now making in a greater or less degree, to adopt for its own use whatever seems to it good in the customs and legislation of other countries. In other words, there has grown up in the sociology of our day what may be called a *comparative department*, the work of which is done mainly by the press; but all reformers assist in it, and there is perhaps no feature of democratic civilization which marks so distinctly the line which separates it from that of the mediæval, and still more that of the ancient world. Down to the French Revolution, — indeed, one might say down to the fall of the first French empire, — the great aim of sociologists and politicians was to preserve the national manners and the national social arrangements distinct and pure. That a contrivance or idea was

foreign was considered a good reason for not adopting it; that it was native, a sufficient reason for retaining it. The work of comparing the national institutions with those of other countries for any purpose except that of self-glorification was treated as a traitor's work, and involved a kind of martyrdom. But there is now hardly a field of social activity in which this work of comparison is not diligently carried on by the ablest and purest minds of every country. With regard to education in all its stages,—to the government of cities, the management of hospitals, the care of the public health, the prevention of crime, the management of prisons, the regulation of the means of public locomotion, the construction and arrangement of dwellings, the composition and preparation of food, the organization and discipline of police, the relations of labor to capital, and of politics to morals and religion,—there is no civilized nation which is not engaged in watching the experiments of its neighbors, and taking notes of them for its own use.

In the field of comparative legislation, properly so called, this same process is also to be witnessed, and it is much more rapid than those who are not familiar with it imagine; but it has been so long the object of special cultivation at the hands of jurists, that less need be said about it than about the larger field of comparative sociology. What is going on in it, however, I may explain by saying that the main feature of legal reform everywhere is the introduction of rules of pure equity, and the subjection of procedure to purely logical and rationalistic methods. The process of codification, for instance, which did not begin until early in the last century, has done away with a state of things on the European Continent which to this generation seems almost incredible, so deeply was society entangled in a network of local usages. There were two hundred different systems of law actually in force in some of the states of Italy little more than a century ago; a single village often lived under laws of its own; Germany had much the same story to tell; that portion of France north of the Loire, if anything, a worse one. Niebuhr speaks of a house and small estate, if I remember rightly, in Dantzic, which descended from generation to generation, under a custom peculiar to that piece of property. Now the result of codification, and of all re-

visions or reforms in the law, is to bring the codes of all countries into closer resemblance, and for the simple reason that they all draw, in making their changes, on the great store of principles and maxims which the Romans did so much to accumulate, and to which the labors of every generation of philosophers add something, and which, being neither more nor less than applications of pure morality to human affairs, belong to no nation or age in particular, but are the patrimony of all, and profitable for all. In the classification of offences, the modes of punishment, the rules of evidence, the laws of marriage and divorce, the laws of inheritance, the limitations on the province of government, the modes of taxation, — one perceives everywhere a gradual but steady disappearance of the differences which for the last twelve hundred years have so strongly marked the jurisprudence of the various states of Christendom. It is hardly necessary to say more, by way of indicating the great extent to which the facts which furnish the materials of legislation, and of which the legislator is bound to take notice, in order to legislate successfully, are multiplying. His field of observation is no longer confined to his own country; it is coextensive with Christendom. He may get a suggestion from England, a warning from Russia, an example from France, just as readily as from his own state.

When we come to ask, however, what are the nature and fitness of the machinery which the civilized world possesses, or is preparing to enable it to do the work of collecting, arranging, comparing, and inferring, which this abundance of material makes necessary, and which the growing complexity and delicacy of social as well as international relations imperiously call for, we find ourselves in the presence of a question of exceeding difficulty, with which, however, nearly everybody's mind is consciously or unconsciously filled. Nevertheless, anything one can say about a radical answer to it in the present stage of the discussion is pretty sure to wear the appearance of rather wild speculation. The question is, whether representative government in the form in which we now have it, that is, a government of large assemblies, or, as has been well said, "government by public meeting," made up of all sorts of persons, none or next to none of them having any special

qualifications for their task beyond agreeing generally with their constituents as to the more prominent public questions, and being therefore competent to express their wishes in an indefinite way, can ever be made an instrument of scientific legislation, that is, can ever perform that nice adjustment and readjustment of men's legal relations which the peculiar nature of modern civilization constantly calls for. It is becoming clearer and clearer every day that the hope that the time is near when a short and simple code will supply the legislative wants of modern commercial communities is utterly chimerical. The number of new laws doubtless need not grow as it now grows ; but as human wants multiply, and the means of gratifying them multiply, laws are sure to multiply too. Every new phenomenon creates new relations with other phenomena, and each new relation calls for a new legal rule or the modification of the old one, and this demand must be met, if not by skilled, then by unskilled legislation. The whole civilized world is now trying to meet it by legislative assemblies. To government by public meeting every civilized country has come or is coming. Parliaments are the great boast and glory of our age, and they have two undoubted, never-to-be-shaken claims on popular respect and admiration. One is, that they are the outward and visible sign of the victory of democracy over oligarchy and monarchy. Their rise into power marked the passage of the sceptre, after that long struggle of which I have already spoken, from the hands of the few to the hands of the many. The other is, that their existence and activity are tokens that the people are really managing their own affairs, and that their will, be it well or ill expressed, is the law of the land. But, nevertheless, it is clearer every day, — all thoughtful men acknowledge it with alarm and anxiety, — that they are proving more and more unequal to the burdens society now lays on them. Their task in simple agricultural communities, such as all communities were down to the beginning of this century, was simple enough. They had to keep things fixed as they were, and they did it. They have now to make things go, and they do not do it. What with ignorance, haste, want of training, and the distractions of an infinite variety of details and of multifarious conflicting interests, legislation is becoming

in every legislative body in the world often rather a positive hindrance than a help to healthy progress, and a sapper rather than strengthener of public morals. The remedy which has been sought, and to some extent applied, is the appointment of committees or commissions for the examination of questions that it would be too outrageous and too ridiculous to treat off-hand by general debate; but such committees naturally partake more or less of the character of the body which appoints them, and, as the creatures of its will, of course their influence is slight, and their recommendations for the most part unheeded. And yet these committees and commissions may really be said to be the sole attempts which we now make in the direction of reform in the legislative machinery.

I risk nothing in saying that this state of things cannot last very long. What the nature of the final remedy will be I do not pretend to predict, but nothing is more certain than that the next great political revolution in the Western world, which will take place after the popular delight in parliaments as mere symbols of victory has passed away, will be some such change in their organization as will not only supply the means of giving prompt, but also scientific expression to the popular will, or, in other words, will place men's relations in society where they never yet have been placed, under the control of trained human reason.

I suppose nobody rises from the consideration of the social and political condition of the world in our day, without asking himself with more or less misgiving — even the most hopeful feel it at times — what, even after we have done everything we can do to make progress healthful, are we coming to? Where and when are the bad tendencies which we all see so thickly around us to be arrested, and by what agencies? When is "the transition period," as it has got to be the fashion to call an uncomfortable and perplexing state of things, to be over? These are questions hard to answer, and which most of us are often obliged to take refuge from in general reliance on the greatness of man's destiny, and on the law of growth, under which history warrants us in believing human society, as well as meaner things, has existed from the beginning, and will exist till the end. They certainly cannot be answered satisfactorily, but they

nevertheless suggest some reflections, which may save most of us the need of answering them. It is not difficult to see that the cycle of civilization which succeeded to that of Greece and Rome is complete, and has brought our modern world to a pass very much such as that in which Rome found herself in the closing days of the Empire. The triumphs of her arms and her polity, continued through several hundred years, brought her at last all along her vast frontier into contact with hordes of barbarians, who for ages had sat in darkness, but the hour of whose liberation at last had come. They broke through her boundary line in every direction, and wasted and destroyed treasures without number, but nevertheless saved enough of her traditions, of her learning, and of her art to take up the work of civilization where she had left it, and carry it forward, with better methods and a loftier ideal than she had ever known. The lesson of that great catastrophe, the most tremendous in human history, was clearly this, that Providence, in the government of the world, cares little for individuals, little for nations, and little for races even, but everything for mankind. The most fortunate of historic communities — those that have been most successful in all the paths which it is permitted human intellect and human energy to explore — have found, as Greece and Rome found, when they reached the end of their career, that as long as any portion of the human race lagged behind, continuous advance was impossible; that at last the inevitable hour came, when the meanest and most despised had to be admitted not only to share, but even in savage haste to trample under foot, the fruits of ages of glorious toil; that, in short, it was a fundamental law of the social organization, that none should labor for themselves alone, and that progress must be diffused sooner or later among all.

The body of persons known as the upper or educated classes of society, who taken altogether, both here and in Europe, have formed a kind of intellectual state, and in whose safe-keeping the interests of civilization have been since the Dark Ages, and to whose labors are mainly due all the advances the world has since made in art, in literature, in science, and in civil polity, now find that, having extended their empire

almost to the remotest parts of the globe, the barbarians can no longer be kept out. With some the mere growth of industrial enterprise under the stimulus of science has brought us into contact; with others the mere cultivation of humanitarian ideas. Steam and commerce have brought the negro and Chinaman to the gates of our civilization, clamorous for admission; the spread of education and the increasing strength of moral ideas have brought the poor and despised and ignorant of all other races. For the frontiers of this modern empire are not territorial, but social; its barbarians are found within its own borders, in the streets and lanes of its own cities. Their rush into the forum and into the temples and palaces and libraries is not an agreeable sight to witness, and it would be foolish to expect that under their ruthless touch many gifts and graces will not be obscured, many arts will not be lost, many a great ideal, at whose shrine the best men and women of thirty generations have found courage and inspiration, will not vanish from the earth to be seen no more. Moreover, those who flatter themselves that we are to have no stage of darkness, that the renaissance is already at hand, if history teaches us anything, assuredly deceive themselves. The process of development is in the moral as in the physical world exceedingly tedious. The "mills of God," as we are constantly reminded, "grind slowly," and the good that it takes ages to prepare for men, it often takes ages for them to learn to enjoy. We shall, doubtless, now pass through a period of much ignorant fermentation; we shall see a great number of old experiments repeated, with the old and well-known result; a great many old discoveries rediscovered, and a great many attempts to embody in legislation wild anticipations bred and nourished through generations of ignorance and privation. But then we know that no conquest of the human intelligence will again be lost; that the records of human experience are beyond the destroyer's reach; that the hold of science on human thought will never again be relaxed; that all that is best in human thought will find every day readier expression and wider influence; and that, whether the end be far or near, it is certain.

E. L. Godkin.

Art. VII. — CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. — *On Early English Pronunciation, with especial reference to Shakespeare and Chaucer.* By Alexander J. Ellis, F. R. S., etc. Part I. *On the Pronunciation of the* XIV*th*, XVI*th*, XVII*th, and* XVIII*th Centuries.* London: Published for the Philological Society, by Asher & Co., London and Berlin; and for the Early English Text Society, by Trübner & Co., 60 Paternoster Row. 1869. 8vo. pp. viii, 416.

The Second Part, which is to complete this learned and valuable work, was expected, according to the author's statement, to have about the same extent as the First, and to be ready for publication before the close of the year 1869. It will investigate the pronunciation of Anglo-Saxon and Old English prior to the fourteenth century, with that of the Teutonic and Scandinavian sources of the English; it will discuss the correspondence of orthography and pronunciation from Anglo-Saxon times to the present day; and it will contain a series of documents and illustrations relating to the pronunciation of our language in the successive periods of its history. Its appearance will be awaited with much interest; yet it will probably be little more than an extended supplement to the part now before us. It is safe to assume that this first part is much the more important of the two, not only exhibiting the author's method, but presenting us with the general views and opinions to which it has led him. We shall be in little danger of doing him injustice if we criticise what we already have, without waiting for that which is yet to come.

It is saying little, to say that Mr. Ellis has surpassed all predecessors in the same field. We believe that he is the first who has really endeavored to collect everything which can throw light on the history of English pronunciation, and to treat the whole subject with scientific precision and thoroughness. In the collection of his material he has used exemplary diligence, sparing no pains to make it complete and exhaustive; and in the discussion of it he has shown a fairness of mind, a freedom from prejudice, a simple love of truth, not less exemplary. He is always careful to present the evidence on which his conclusions are founded, and to distinguish conclusions which seem to him only probable, in greater or less degree, from those which he regards as certain. He does not fail to recognize the uncertainties which affect much of the evidence, — uncertainties arising either from the nature of the subject or from the peculiarities of individual witnesses. Nor does

he keep back the evidence which seems unfavorable to what he thinks the best-supported conclusions; but presents the whole case, making it possible for the reader to form an independent judgment.

In the notation of spoken sounds, Mr. Ellis uses a comprehensive system, which he calls by the name *palaeotype* (only the *old types* being used in it), and sets it forth in a brief introduction. It is based on the Roman alphabet, and contains no sign that cannot be found in the cases of an ordinary printing-office. To secure the necessary variety, italics, small capitals, and (in some instances) inverted letters, are used to denote sounds distinct from, though akin to, those expressed by the corresponding Roman letters. As a further means to the same end, the forms (h, j, *w*) are used, without any consonant power, merely as diacritical signs, modifying the sounds of the letters with which they are connected; while the forms (H, J, w, and q) represent the consonant sounds in *h*ay, *y*ea, *w*ay, w*ing*. Long vowels are represented by doubling the signs which stand for the corresponding short vowels; diphthongs, by writing their elementary vowels in immediate succession; successive vowels, if they do not form a diphthong, are separated by a comma. Words and sounds, written in palaeotype, if mixed with ordinary writing, are distinguished by enclosing them in marks of parenthesis; thus, (H*ee*,*i*q) for *haying*. Mr. Ellis is careful to explain that this mode of writing is not designed to supersede the current orthography in popular use; it is intended for scientific purposes, as a means of designating conveniently and exactly the sounds heard in English and in other languages. In his tabular Key to Palaeotype he gives more than two hundred and fifty distinct sounds, with their notation in his system. He also compares these signs of his with the letter-forms devised by Mr. Melville Bell, and described in his "Visible Speech." The number of signs required in treating of English pronunciation past and present is, of course, much less than two hundred and fifty. Among those which occur often in the book we may be allowed to give here the most important, as it will be convenient to use them in the statements and criticisms that we have to offer. The short vowels (a, e, i, o, u) have the Italian sounds; but these are almost all different from the English short vowels in *pat*, *pet*, *pit*, *pot*, *put*, which are represented in palaeotype by (æ, e, *i*, ɔ, *u*). The long vowels (aa, ee, ii, oo, uu), with Italian sounds, correspond more nearly to the English long in *par*, *pale*, *peel*, *pole*, *pool*, which are represented in palaeotype by (aa, *ee*, ii, *oo*, uu), where (*ee*, *oo*) are closer sounds than (ee, oo). The forms (y, œ) stand for the German *ü*, *ö*. The English short and long *a* in *want*, *war* are expressed by the small capital (A, AA); the short *u* in *but* by the inverted (ə); the diphthongs in *height*,

house, by (əi, əu); the diphthongal *u* in *tune*, by (iu). As to the consonants, we have already spoken of (h, j, w, q); and need only add (ɹ) for the weak final *r* in *fair*, and (th, dh, sh, zh, tsh, dzh) for the spirant sounds in *thew*, *thou*, *shoe*, *azure*, *chew*, *Jew*.

Mr. Ellis commences his inquiry with the pronunciation of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. From the known present he goes back first of all to the recent past. For this period he has the aid of a long series of orthoepical writers; and he begins by enumerating these in the order of time, giving full titles of works, and adding brief descriptions and criticisms. The writers to whom he refers most frequently are: John Palsgrave (French Grammar), 1530; W. Salesbury, 1547, 1567; Sir Thomas Smith, 1568; John Hart, 1569; William Bullokar, 1580; Alexander Gill, 1619; Ben Jonson (English Grammar), 1640; John Wallis (English Grammar), 1653; Philip Wilkins (Philosophical Language), 1668; Owen Price, 1668; C. Cooper, 1685; John Jones, 1701; an anonymous Expert Orthographist, 1704; James Buchanan, 1766; Benjamin Franklin (Scheme for a New Alphabet), 1768. He manifests an especial preference for Salesbury and Wallis. The latter, who was Professor of Mathematics at Oxford, wrote a *Grammatica Linguae Anglicanae*, with a prefixed *Tractatus grammatico-physicus de Loquela*, in which he gives an elaborate description of the English sounds, with the positions and movements of the vocal organs in producing them. The former, a Welshman, educated at Oxford, prepared an English Dictionary for the use of his countrymen, with an interesting and valuable introduction, written in Welsh, on English pronunciation.

From such materials Mr. Ellis endeavors to reconstruct the prevailing pronunciation of our language during the three centuries which preceded our own. He does not disguise from himself the very great difficulties of the task. There are few things harder than to understand the descriptions of spoken sounds. Even when the writer is intelligent, it is no very easy matter to reproduce the precise position of the vocal organs, the precise utterance, which he meant to describe. But most writers have been ignorant both of the physical mechanism of speech and of the true relations of sounds. The terms which they have used are very often inexact or unmeaning. Who can be sure as to the force of *thick*, *thin*, *full*, *round*, *flat*, *hard*, *soft*, *rough*, *smooth*, *coarse*, *fine*, *sharp*, *dull*, *clear*, *obscure*, and many similar epithets, which are so commonly and so fancifully applied to vowels and consonants? If the writer identifies a particular English sound with one in some foreign language, as the French, a variety of doubts at once suggest themselves. Are we sure that he meant to assert an absolute identity, or

only a resemblance, between the sounds compared? Are we sure that the French sound has not varied since the time in question? Are we sure that it was uniform at that time? Are we sure that the writer correctly apprehended the French sound of which he speaks? Misapprehension of foreign sounds is a thing of constant occurrence. Mr. Ellis mentions a remarkable instance in a lecture by Professor Blackie of Edinburgh, on the pronunciation of Greek; after saying that long *α* in Greek had the sound of Italian *a* in *amare*, the lecturer added immediately that "long *α* should always be pronounced like English *aw* or *au*, as in *cawl*, *maul*, etc."! Even experts may differ as to the real character of the foreign sound. Speaking of the French vowels before the nasal *n*, in *an*, *vin*, *on*, *un*, Mr. Ellis represents them, first as they seem to his own ear, and then as they appear to Dr. Rapp, M. Féline, M. Favarger, and Mr. Melville Bell; and no two of these gentlemen agree entirely with each other. Mr. Ellis further tells us that he differs from Mr. Bell in his pronunciation of several of the key-words which the latter has used to show the exact phonetic value of his symbols.

While fully recognizing these difficulties which beset his inquiry, our author has not allowed himself to be deterred from pursuing it. Taking up in succession the English vowels and consonants, he endeavors to ascertain, from a detailed examination of his authorities, how each was sounded in the sixteenth century, what changes (if any) it has undergone since then, and at what time they occurred. Most readers, we presume, will be surprised at the amount of change which he finds in English pronunciation, and especially in the vowel sounds, since the sixteenth century. Thus, to commence with the short vowels, he holds that only *ĕ* and *ĭ* were pronounced then as they now are, that is, as (e) and (*i*); as to *ă*, *ŏ*, *ŭ*, he believes that they were then pronounced (a, o, *u*), the first two as in Italian, and that the now prevailing sounds for them, viz. (æ, ɔ, ə), as seen in the words *cat*, *cot*, *cut*, came in during the seventeenth century. This may be true as to *ŏ* and *ŭ*; but we cannot help thinking, for reasons which will appear presently, that our current sound of *ă* is older than he makes it, — that it belonged to the pronunciation of the sixteenth century.

Next, as to the long vowels, according to Mr. Ellis, the *ē*, which in Chaucer's time (the fourteenth century) was always (ee), began to take the sound (ii) during the fifteenth. In the sixteenth, a practice arose of representing the latter sound (ii) by doubling the vowel, as *ee*; while the old sound (ee), where it remained, was often distinguished by an added *a*, as *ea*. Thus *been*, *reed*, *greet*, were pronounced as (biin, riid, griit); but *bean*, *read*, *great*, as (been, reed, greet). At length, however, the

new sound (ii) was extended to words which had for a time retained the old one, the change being particularly rapid about the end of the seventeenth century, so that early in the eighteenth *ea* had come to have in most cases the same sound as *ee*. It is curious to compare the lists of words with *ea*, given by orthoepists during the transition period, and to note the progress of the change. We find here, as in many such revolutions, that particular individuals carry out the innovating tendency to an extent which is not finally sanctioned by the prevailing usage; some writers give *break*, *great*, *indeavour*, *deaf*, etc., with the sound of (ii). Mr. Ellis, by the way, speaks of (diif) as a pronunciation which he has never been fortunate enough to hear.

The ō has up to a certain point the same history as the ē. Before the close of the fifteenth century, it had in many words passed from its proper sound of (oo) into the closer (uu). And here also the practice arose in the sixteenth century of representing the new sound (uu) by doubling the letter, as *oo;* while the old sound, where it remained, was often distinguished by an added *a*, as *oa*. Thus, *moon*, *rood*, were pronounced as (muun, ruud) ; but *moan*, *road*, as (moon, rood). Here, however, the parallel ceases. The movement had already spent its force before the Elizabethan time. While *ea* in most words passed on from (ee) to (ii), *oa* has never passed from (oo) to (uu); with few exceptions, — such as *move*, *prove*, and (with shortened vowel) *love*, *dove*, — the ō has taken on the (uu) sound only in words where that sound was indicated in the sixteenth century by the writing *oo*.

Long ī and *ou*, which in Chaucer's time were simple sounds, the first being pronounced (ii) and the second (uu), had to a great extent become diphthongs in the sixteenth century. In Mr. Ellis's opinion, they were more clearly diphthongal then than now, being sounded as (ei) and (ou), where each vowel must be understood as having its proper force distinctly audible. In the present pronunciation the first element is obscure; the initial position of the organs is not maintained long enough to give a fully characterized utterance; hence, orthoepists differ much as to the first vowel sound in English long ī and *ou*. Mr. Ellis regards it as (ə), and writes the diphthongs as now pronounced (əi, əu). This pronunciation, he thinks, came in during the seventeenth century, or perhaps during the latter part of the sixteenth.

For *ei* and *ai* our author's results are particularly interesting. He shows that in the sixteenth century they were true diphthongs, differing little, if at all, in their pronunciation, which must have been much the same with that of our affirmative *ay*. It is observed that in Shakespeare's minor poems there is but one real instance — in the words *mane*, *again* — of a rhyme between ā and *ai*. The change by which these com-

binations came to be sounded as simple vowels — usually as (*ee*), but *ei* in some words as (iĭ) — is referred, like so many other changes, to the seventeenth century.

As to long *ā*, — in *sale*, *came*, *fate*, etc., — Mr. Ellis's conclusions will cause greater surprise, and will perhaps meet with less acceptance. He holds that in the sixteenth century such words were pronounced (saal, kaam, faat) with the Italian sound of *a;* and that, in the seventeenth, the pronunciation changed to (sææl, kææm, fææt), differing only in length of sound from our *Sal*, *Cam*, *fat*. This sound, which he finds first distinctly apparent in the description of Wallis (1653), would seem to have been only transitional, as it gave place at the close of that century to (ee), which has since passed into the closer (*ee*), thus, (*seel*, *keem*, *feet*). What now is the reason for believing that English long *a* had in Shakespeare's time the Italian sound of *a*? Palsgrave, in 1530, identifies the English letter with the Italian; but Palsgrave's ear, as Mr. Ellis admits, was none of the most delicate. Hart, in 1569, identifies the English letter with the German, Italian, French, Spanish, and Welsh *a;* but this, as Mr. Ellis says, is too wide a comparison, and leaves us in doubt as to the real sound. The witness really relied upon is Salesbury, who says, in 1547, that "*a* in English is the same sound as *a* in Welsh," and represents the pronunciation of *ale*, *pale*, *sale*, etc., by writing them for Welshmen, *aal*, *paal*, *sal*, etc. This testimony makes it pretty clear that English *a* had not then the same sound as at present. If it had, Salesbury would almost certainly have compared it with Welsh *e;* and Palsgrave and Hart, with *e* in Italian, French, etc. No one now could for a moment think of giving *a*, rather than *e*, in those languages as the nearest equivalent for English long *a*. But as proof of the sound (aa), this evidence is not equally convincing. It is curious that in the following century, Wallis, whose testimony is regarded as clearest for the sound (ææ), still identifies the English and Welsh *a*. It appears that a fraction of the Welsh people now give this sound (æ) to their own *a;* and such possibly may have been the pronunciation of Salesbury. It is, doubtless, more probable that his Welsh *a* was an (a); but if so, he had no Welsh letter which would correctly represent an (æ), and he may very naturally have regarded *a* as the nearest Welsh equivalent. But what is most important, we have distinct positive evidence from independent witnesses that the English *a*, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, differed from the French *a*, and approached to the French *e*. In the fragment of a treatise on the pronunciation of French, by an unknown author, but with the date 1528 (two years earlier than Palsgrave's book), is found the following statement as to the French A and E: "A. ought to be pronounced fro the botom of the stomak, and all openly; E. a lytell hyer

in the throte, there properly where the englysshe man soundeth his á." Similarly, Gilles du Guez, in his account of French pronunciation, which seems to have been printed about 1532, says: "Ye shal pronounce your [French] *a* as wyde open mouthed as ye can; your [French] *e*, as ye do in latyn, almost as brode as ye pronounce your *a* in englysshe." These passages do not prove indeed that English *a* was *identical* with French *e;* in fact, the last of them excludes the idea of such an identity. But they prove an *approximation* of the English *a* to the French *e*, which is scarcely reconcilable with the sound (a) for the former. If we should assume that English *a*, at the opening of the sixteenth century, had, nearly or exactly, the sound of (æ), we should account in the most natural manner for the expressions of these writers. A similar sound, at the end of this century, is indicated by Peter Erondell, in his French Grammar (London, 1605). Distinguishing the French *a* from the English, he represents the sound of English *ale* by the French writing *esl* with silent *s;* that is, he finds the nearest equivalent for English *ā* in the French open *ê*. And Mr. Ellis himself finds the same sound, *ā* = (ææ), clearly set forth in the description of Wallis (1653). Are we not then warranted in concluding that English *a*, as early as the year 1528, had varied from the normal sound of (a, aa), and had assumed this sound of (æ) for *ă*, (ææ) for *ā*? The change may then be referred with much probability to the fifteenth century; and may naturally be regarded as the starting-point in that great revolution which, since the days of Chaucer, has transformed the whole vowel system of our language.

If we find ourselves obliged to dissent from Mr. Ellis on the pronunciation of long *a*, we are equally unable to agree with him on that of long *u*. He regards this vowel as having had, through the sixteenth century, and much of the seventeenth, the same sound as the French *u*. The conclusion is not indeed as incredible as it may seem at first view. Our English *ū* is nearly confined to words which have come to us either from the French itself or from the Latin after our language had fallen under French influence. The Anglo-Saxon and the oldest English had a long *ū*, but for five centuries it has been represented by *ou* or *ow*. The *ū* in Chaucer's time, and ever since, belongs to the Romance part of the language. The sound of French *u* — (y, yy) as represented in palaeotype — is certainly a strange and difficult one for most speakers of English. But Mr. Ellis assures us that it is common in some of the English dialects at the present time. "In East Anglia, in Devonshire, in Cumberland, as well as in Scotland, (yy) and its related sounds are quite at home." We must admit, then, as something quite possible, that this may have been a current and prevailing sound of *ū* in the sixteenth

and seventeenth centuries. It is simply a question of evidence. Here again, as for long *a*, we find a number of orthoepists asserting the identity of the English and French sounds. Among these we may reckon Palsgrave (1530), who speaks only of English *ew*, but appears to have meant the same sound as that of *ū ;* also, Sir T. Smith (1568), Hart (1569), Bullokar (1580), and lastly, Wallis (1653), whose testimony on this head is perfectly distinct and positive. Yet in this testimony of Wallis we find the clearest proof of the unreliable character of such identifications. For Bishop Wilkins, in 1668, speaking of the French *u*, declares, not only that the English do not use it, but that it is very hard for them to pronounce it. His language is: "As for the *u Gallicum*, or *whistling u*, though it cannot be denied to be a distinct simple vowel, yet it is of so laborious and difficult pronunciation to all those nations amongst whom it is not used (*as to the English*)," etc. Let it be observed that Wallis and Wilkins were contemporaries, that both were natives of Southern England, that both were for some time fellow-collegians in Oxford, that both must have mixed in the same society, and that their books were separated by an interval of only fifteen years. The discrepancy between their statements cannot be accounted for by difference of time, place, education, association, and the like. One or the other must have been in error. But a writer's statement that a foreign sound is strange to his own people and difficult for them to utter, is not in itself likely to be erroneous ; and in this case it is confirmed by other evidence, all going to show that the pronunciation of *u* since Wilkins's time has been what it now is. If then the sound of French *u* was not used, and could hardly be pronounced, by the English in 1668, it cannot possibly have been the current sound of English *u* in 1653. Wallis's identification must have been an error ; the native and foreign sounds which he compared were not really identical. And if a writer so intelligent and careful as Wallis could fall into this error, we need not be surprised to find it in Palsgrave, Smith, Hart, etc. Indeed, the last-named writer seems to be at variance with himself, as in an earlier treatise he identifies the vowel *u* with the word *you*. He also describes it as a diphthong, composed of *i* and *u ;* it is true, he applies the same description to the French *u ;* but that may only show that he misapprehended the foreign sound.

But we have positive evidence that the French and English sounds were not identical. Erondell (1605), to whose French Grammar we have referred before, gives a careful description of the way in which French *u* is to be uttered, and directs the learner to pronounce *musique, punir, subvenir*, " not after the English pronunciation, not as if written *muesique, puenir, suevenir*," with the English *ue* of *sue, due*, etc. Holy-

band (*French Littleton*, 1609) says: "You must take paine to pronounce our v [i. e. French *u*] otherwise then in English; for we do think, when Englishmen do profer v [i. e. their own *u*], they say, you." Here Mr. Ellis finds a distinct recognition of our present sound of *ū*. But we should hardly speak of it as "the first distinct recognition." For Salesbury himself (1547) indicates the same sound when he says, "u vowel answers to the power of the two Welsh letters *u*, *w*, and its usual power is *uw*, as shown in the following words, TRUE *truw* verus, VERTUE *vertuw* probitas." It is true that the Welsh *uw*, as heard in *Duw*, "God," is not quite the same with our long *u* (as in *due*); but it is a pretty near approximation to it, and the nearest which is possible in the Welsh language. The difference is that in the Welsh *uw* the two elements of the diphthong are a little more distinct; we can hear the initial element as an (*i*), very short, but perfectly recognizable, before the closely following (*u*). The English diphthongal *ū* of *due*, *tune*, *lute*, etc., has the same elements, but not with the same distinctness of utterance; the initial position of the organs is not held long enough to give a clearly characterized sound. In this respect it resembles the English diphthongs *i* and *ou*; and hence, like these, it has often been regarded as a simple sound. Wallis speaks of it as such, in distinction from the Welsh *uw*; and when he identifies it with French *u*, he gives prominence to this fact, that both are simple vowels.

We believe, then, that English *ū* had in Salesbury's time, that is, in the first half of the sixteenth century, substantially the same pronunciation as at present. In the loose identifications with French *u*, made by some writers, we find no sufficient proof of the contrary; the last and most distinct, by Wallis, is refuted by the nearly contemporaneous statements of Wilkins. In tracing back the pronunciation of the letter from the nineteenth century to the sixteenth, there is a presumption in favor of the present sound, unless pretty strong evidence can be found for a different one. We do find in our authorities some evidence of this kind; but it is liable to grave suspicions, and is more than balanced by positive indications of the present sound. Perhaps we have dwelt longer than we ought both on this point and on the sixteenth-century pronunciation of *ā*. But they seemed to be among the most interesting questions raised by our author in his endeavor to determine the actual living utterance of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth; and they are well fitted to illustrate the amount and character of the evidence on which he relies in the discussion of these questions. We have only to add that the testimonies which we have brought forward in opposition to his views have all been derived from his own pages, where they stand fairly presented and candidly considered.

We pass on to the consonants, the treatment of which by our author will furnish much less occasion for remark. Of the weak final *r*, as heard in *car*, *care*, which he represents by (ɹ), he finds no trace whatever in the sixteenth century. Even Wallis and Wilkins are silent in regard to it. But Ben Jonson (1640) implies its existence, when he speaks of the letter as sounded in two ways, "firme in the beginning of the words, and more *liquid* in the middle and ends." As to its present weakness, the language of Mr. Ellis is very emphatic; he represents it as little more than a vanishing quantity, and indeed as having vanished to a great extent from English pronunciation. He says: "This second (ɹ) may diphthongize with any preceding vowel. After (a, ʌ, ɔ) the effect is rather to lengthen the preceding vowel than to produce a distinct diphthong. Thus, *farther*, *lord*, scarcely differ from *father*, *laud*; that is, the diphthongs (aɹ, ɔɹ) are heard almost as the long vowels (aa, ʌʌ). That a distinction is made by many, by more perhaps than are aware of it, is certain; but it is also certain that in the mouths of by far the greater number of speakers in the south of England the absorption of the (ɹ) is as complete as the absorption of the (l) in *talk*, *walk*, *psalm*, where it has also left its mark on the preceding vowel. When Dickens wrote Count *Smorl Tork*, he meant *Small Talk*, and *no ordinary reader would distinguish between them*." And again: "The diphthongs (eɹ, əɹ) are very difficult to separate from each other and from (əə). But the slight raising of the point of the tongue will distinguish the diphthongs from the vowel in the mouth of the careful speaker, that is, one who trains his organs to do so. *No doubt the great majority of speakers do not make any difference.*" It is fortunate for this much-abused letter that so large a part of the English-speaking world is found in America, where the first English settlers brought this *r* in a less attenuated state, and where their descendants have been largely re-enforced by users of a yet stronger *r* from Ireland and Scotland and the continent of Europe. Instead of losing the final *r*, like our brethren in Southern England, we are more likely to restore it to its ancient equivalency with the initial letter.

As to the combination *wr*, — in *write*, *wreck*, *wrath*, etc., — it appears from the testimony of Hart that the *w* was not entirely lost in the sixteenth century. It is Mr. Ellis's opinion that *wr* was sounded, not only then, but from the earliest Anglo-Saxon times, as (rw), or more exactly as (r*w*), a labialized *r*, the product of an effort to pronounce *r* and *w* at one and the same time. The French *roi* he represents by (r*w*a); and he holds that *wrath*, *wreck*, *write* were pronounced (r*w*ath, r*w*ek, r*w*eit). This seems to us improbable for Old-English, and still more for Anglo-Saxon. If *wrath* had been pronounced thus, it would almost certainly

have been written *rwath*. To English ears the French *roi* appears to begin with the sound of *r* followed by that of *w;* it is safe to say that not one man in a hundred would think of it as beginning with a *w* followed by an *r*. Even the words *what, when, white*, etc., were by the Anglo-Saxons originally and generally written with *hw*, not *wh*. Would they not have followed the same analogy by writing *rw* instead of *wr*, if the sound had been what our author supposes? The copyists were accustomed to spell very much according to their own ear and taste; would they not, sometimes at least, have used the order *rw?* If *hw* has been changed to *wh*, it was probably not from any doubt as to the real order of the elements, but from the influence of the combinations *ph, ch, th, rh*, constantly presented in Latin orthography. There could be no such reason for adopting *wr* in preference to the seemingly more natural order *rw*. And if we look at other Teutonic languages, we find everywhere the same succession. Thus *wrath* appears in the Old Icelandic as *vreidhi*, in Swedish and Danish as *vrede; wrong* in Icelandic is *vrangr*, Danish *vrang*, Swedish *vrång*. For *wring* the Gothic has *vriggan;* for *wreak* it has *vrikan, vrakjan;* for *write* it has *vrits* (Gr. κεραία, "point of a letter"). In view of these considerations, who can doubt that the Anglo-Saxon writing *wr* represents the real order of the sounds, or what would appear such to hearers generally? If so, then (*rw*) cannot have been the Anglo-Saxon pronunciation; nor is there any reason for supposing that the Old-English pronunciation differed in this case from the Anglo-Saxon. The only argument we can see for Mr. Ellis's (*rw*) is the difficulty of making a true English *w* audible before *r* at the beginning of a word. We do not deny the difficulty; nor do we undertake to determine the precise sound of *wr;* but we could easily believe that *w* may have had in this case a somewhat stronger sound than we are wont to give it, — a sound perhaps approaching to the South German *w* (a *v* pronounced without pressure of the teeth against the lips), which Mr. Ellis (p. 290) finds on British ground in the Aberdeen pronunciation of *write* as (bhriit).

In this connection we have to confess some feeling of doubt, if not of scepticism, as to our author's whole theory of labialized consonants. He finds in French *loi* (lwa) a labialized *l*, which he thinks existed once in English, — *talk* being once sounded (talwk), — "but it has died out"; yet why not recognize it in *always?* So he finds a labialized *k* in *quell* (kwel), a labialized *t* in *twin*, a labialized *d* in *dwell*, etc. Here the *qu, tw, dw*, are in his view simple consonants, a *k, t, d*, pronounced in a labial position. To us they still appear as composite sounds. Compare *high dwell the birds* with *hide well the birds;* in continuous utterance are they not perfectly alike? What Mr. Ellis says of *twin*

and *dwell*, "that the opening of the lips [from the rounded closure required for a *w*] is really simultaneous with the release of the (t, d) contact," we are unable to reconcile with the testimony of the ear as to our own pronunciation and that which we hear around us.

The wretched weakness of utterance which has changed *know* to *no* (converting science into mere negation) was, according to all the authorities, still unknown, or at least not prevalent, in the sixteenth century; nor did it become universal before the close of the seventeenth. So too it appears that the *gh* in *light*, *weigh*, *bough*, etc., was heard, though probably with only a feeble utterance in the sixteenth century. As to the precise sound, there is an uncertainty; perhaps, as in Scotland now, it may have had both sounds of the German *ch*. It hardly survived the middle of the seventeenth century. In most words it simply dropped away without any further change; but a preceding short *i* became long, as in *light*, *night*, etc. In some cases, however, it was replaced by another spirant sound, an *f*, as in *laugh*, *cough*, *rough*, and in the vulgarisms, *oft*, *thoft*, for *ought*, *thought*. In *sigh*, *height*, *drought*, it was replaced, at least in occasional use, by the spirant *th*: the pronunciations *sith*, *heith*, *drouth*, are mentioned by orthoepists at the beginning of the last century; and *drouth* is still heard in our country, and has even been adopted in an American Dictionary of the English language.

The suppression of the *h*, like that of the weak *r*, would perhaps have become an accomplished fact if our language had been wholly dependent on the people of Southern England. On this subject our author remarks:—

"In England the use of the *h* (H) among the illiterate seems to depend upon emphatic utterance. Many persons when speaking quietly will never introduce the (H), but when rendered nervous or excited, or when desiring to speak particularly well, they abound in strong and unusual aspirations. It is also singular how difficult it is for those accustomed to omit the *h*, to recover it, and how provokingly they sacrifice themselves on the most undesired occasions by this social shibboleth. In endeavoring to pronounce the fatal letter, they generally give themselves great trouble, and consequently produce a harshness quite unknown to those who pronounce (H) naturally. An English author, S. Hirst, writing an English Grammar in German, in which fifty quarto pages are devoted to a minute account of the pronunciation of English, actually bestows one hundred and sixty-seven quarto lines of German, measuring about ninety feet, upon attempting to show that formerly *h* was not pronounced in English, and that it was altogether an orthoepistic fancy to pronounce it, saying that almost all non-linguists would admit that *h* was generally mute, or at most scarcely audible, and that linguists who denied this in theory gave into the practice. The division of the people is not exactly into linguists and non-linguists, but it must be owned that very large masses of the

people, even of those tolerably educated and dressed in silk and broadcloth, agree with the French, Italians, Spaniards, and Greeks, in not pronouncing the letter H."

The sounds of *sh* in such words as *sure*, *pressure*, *mission*, *special*, *motion*, and *zh* in such as *measure*, *vision*, *excision*, are unrecognized by the orthoepists of the sixteenth century, and are not mentioned before the middle of the seventeenth. Yet traces of these changes are pointed out in Shakespeare and Rowley. Nor can it be doubted that of the other changes ascribed to the seventeenth century, quite a number were already in progress during the sixteenth. Thus, if Hart had not written, there would have been no evidence that the pronunciation of *ai* as a simple vowel (ee) was known to the sixteenth century: all other orthoepists of that age make it a true diphthong; but Hart in 1569 gives it uniformly the sound of (ee). Mr. Ellis regards the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries as the grand periods of disturbance and revolution in the history of our language; he thinks with much reason that they owed this character to the political agitations, the great civil contests, by which they were shaken. The intermediate century, the sixteenth, he looks upon as a period of comparative stability and repose, both in politics and in pronunciation. Perhaps this is the true conception. Yet to our mind the facts reported in this book suggest rather the view that a great revolution in English pronunciation was going forward from the opening of the fifteenth to the close of the seventeenth century, and that it moved on with uninterrupted and almost unremitted progress from the beginning to the end of its course.

In the fourth chapter, which concludes this first part, Mr. Ellis deals with the pronunciation of English during the fourteenth century. Here he finds his principal means of investigation in the poetry, and especially in the rhymes, of Chaucer and Gower. He foresees that his procedure will be objected to on the ground that imperfect rhymes, which often occur in modern verse, are likely to have been yet more common in that earlier and ruder age. But he denies the force of the objection, contending that the probabilities of the case point the other way. A rhyme which is good to the eye, but not to the ear, may be tolerated by reading men; to men who do not read — and such to a great extent were the public of Chaucer and Gower — it is no rhyme at all. Appealing mainly to the ear, these poets were actually less likely than later rhymers to satisfy themselves with loose and inexact correspondences of sound. This *a priori* argument he fortifies with remarkable success by an examination of their verses, as represented by the best manuscripts. In Wright's edition of the Canterbury Tales, founded on the Harleian MS., No. 7,334, and containing 17,368 lines, he finds less

than fifty rhymes in which the spelling indicates a difference of pronunciation. Of these few exceptions most can be removed, either by the readings of other manuscripts, or by conjectural changes of a simple and natural character. The 33,000 verses of Gower's *Confessio Amantis* furnish only nine instances of faulty rhymes, and for these it is shown that the editor, not the author, is really responsible. The nature and force of the evidence derived from the rhymes of these poets is perhaps most strikingly seen in the case of the long *i* or *y*. These letters appear in a multitude of rhymes like the following: *wyse* and *justise*, *write* and *merite*, *vice* and *office*, *wyn* and *famyn*, *side* and *Cupide*, *lyke* and *retorike*, *while* and *Virgile*, *Bible* and *possible*, *fynde* and *Inde*, *I* and *enemy*, *therby* and *mercy*, *sky* and *truely*, *why* and *almighty*, *by* and *lady*, etc. Of the second words in these pairs, the last three, *truely*, *almighty*, and *lady*, come to us from the Anglo-Saxon. They still have in the last syllable the same vowel sound, or nearly the same, as in that language. It is not to be supposed that in the fourteenth century they should have taken up a sound like our diphthongal *i* long, only to lose it again by the sixteenth. Still less can we suppose this in reference to *justise*, *merite*, *office*, *famyn*, *Cupide*, *retorike*, *Virgile*, *possible*, *Inde*, *enemy*, *mercy*; which in Chaucer's time had just come in from the French, retaining still their native French accent, and could scarcely have undergone a change of vowel sound so sudden and extreme. But these violent suppositions are only to be avoided by admitting that the first words in the several rhyming pairs — *wyse*, *write*, *vice*, *wyn*, *side*, *lyke*, *while*, *Bible*, *fynde*, *sky*, *why*, *I*, *by*, and *therby* — still retained in the fourteenth century their primitive sound of *i* as (ii) or (*ii*). By similar evidence, less abundant indeed, yet sufficiently decisive, it is shown that Chaucer's *ou* or *ow*, in *hous*, *how*, *dowte*, *aboute*, *powre*, *doun*, *broun*, *founde*, etc., had not yet acquired the diphthongal sound which it bore in the sixteenth century, but was generally pronounced as a simple (uu); only where the *ou* or *ow* corresponded to an Anglo-Saxon *ow*, *aw*, did it have a diphthongal pronunciation as (oou). And in like manner it is proved that *a*, *e*, *o*, had the same sounds as are generally given to those vowels in the languages of continental Europe.

But the most important, and at the same time the most difficult point in the language of Chaucer and Gower is the pronunciation of the final unaccented *e*. Mr. Ellis has greatly enriched his work by taking into it, in a condensed form, the masterly researches on this subject by Professor Child of Harvard University, which were published in the Memoirs of the American Academy, Vol. IX. Professor Child has proved that the unaccented final *e* was generally sounded in the poetry

of Chaucer and Gower; but also that it was frequently silent. Of these exceptional cases, he is able to refer much the greater part to certain general principles or habits; but others seem to depend on the mere caprice of the author, and serve to indicate a varying usage and a progressive tendency to suppress the letter. The parallel furnished in German poetry by the frequent and capricious omission of the final *e*, is noticed by Professor Child; though here the influences of education and literature will doubtless save the letter from total extinction, while the sensible habit of leaving it unwritten where it is unpronounced will save much time and toil to the philologists of the future.

Mr. Ellis proposes a uniform orthography for Chaucer, which he would wish to apply also to other writers of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. It is founded on the orthography of the Harleian MS., already referred to; the usual modes of spelling in that MS., the representations usually given by it to the different sounds of the language as it then was, are to be made universal, the occasional exceptions being altered into conformity with the general rule. It is the spelling which the copyist of that MS. would presumably have used if he had been intent on a uniform orthography. A text of the fourteenth or fifteenth century, printed according to this system, could be read without difficulty, and by a little practice even fluently, with a pronunciation not widely different from that of its own time. It seems to us desirable that some such texts should be prepared and printed for school use. If a historical study of the English language and literature is to be made common in our educational institutions, it is important to lessen, in some degree at least, the difficulties arising from the endless and needless variations of Old-English spelling. It would be possible, and perhaps expedient, in such books, to give in the margin the actual spelling of one or two good manuscripts, in the most important cases where it differed from that used in the text. At the same time we think that if Chaucer is really to be *popularized*, it can only be done by modernizing his orthography. The words which belong to the modern language must appear in the spelling with which all are familiar. But it is not less necessary that the text should be so given that it can be read rhythmically. An uncertain and halting rhythm, which fails to fulfil its own promises, and is continually leaving the reader in the lurch, is beyond measure disagreeable, and even painful, to a rhythmic ear; plain prose is infinitely better than such a rhythm. To cure this defect, the unaccented *e* must be supplied just as far as is requisite to give each verse a proper rhythmic succession of syllables and accents. We venture to add the opening lines of the Prologue to the Canterbury Tales as a specimen of the arrangement which we have

in mind. Where the accent of a word varies from that now usual, it is marked in the text by an acute over the vowel of the accented syllable. A double dot over an *e* which is now silent shows that it is to be pronounced, and to make a separate syllable, in reading. A small circle over an *e* which is now heard shows that it is to be suppressed, or at least that it does not count as a syllable in the verse. The double dot and the circle may also be used for like purposes over other vowels. Where an *e*, which is not even written now, has to be supplied in reading, it is represented by a reversed apostrophe, as [‘].

"When that Aprílʻ with his showerʻs sweet
The drought of March hath piercëd to the root,
And bathëd every vein in such liquór,
Of which virtúe engendered is the flower; —
When Zephïrus eke with his sweetʻ breath
Inspirëd hath in every holt and heath
The tender cropʻs, and the youngʻ sun
Hath in the Ram his halfʻ course y-run,
And smallʻ fowlʻs makë melody,
That sleepʻ all the night with opën eye,
So pricketh them natúre in their [a] coráges: —
Then longʻ folk to go on pilgrimages,
And palmers for to seekʻ strangë strands
To [b] fernë [c] halwës, [d] kouthe in sundry lands;
And specially, from every shirëʻs end
Of Engʻlánd, to Canterbur̂y they wend,
The holy blissful martyr for to seek,
That them hath holpen when that they were sick."

[a] hearts. [b] distant. [c] saints. [d] known.

In such a text we should have a genuine Chaucer, the *ipsa verba*, if not the *ipsissima*, of the poet himself. But it would be free from the worst of those stumbling-blocks which now vex and baffle the ordinary reader. The general aspect of the words would be familiar to his eye; the sense would be almost or quite as easy to apprehend as that of Shakespeare; and the lines would yield without pains and puzzling a rhythm fairly satisfactory to the ear. In thus giving to Chaucer a modernized orthography, we should only be treating him as we do Shakespeare; no editor thinks of reproducing the spelling of the old folios. If Shakespeare were accessible only in that antiquated orthography, it is certain that the number of his readers and the extent of his influence would be seriously diminished.

Since the foregoing paragraphs were written we have received "Part II." of the work under review. This, however, does not finish the book. "On account of the unexpected length" of the author's

"investigations, the Societies for which they are published have found it most convenient to divide them into *four* parts, instead of *two*, as previously contemplated." This second part contains a little more than two hundred pages, of which about two thirds are occupied with the pronunciation of English prior to the fourteenth century, as well as that of the Anglo-Saxon, Old Icelandic, and Gothic; while the remainder treats of the correspondence of orthography with pronunciation from Anglo-Saxon times to the present day. A hasty glance has shown us that it is rich in curious and instructive matter; but we cannot yet undertake to criticise, or even to describe, its contents. We will speak of only one point which has chanced to attract our attention while turning over its pages. In representing, as he does by palaeotype, the original pronunciation of various specimen-texts of early English, it seems to us that Mr. Ellis has hardly been as careful and exact as could have been desired in reference to vowel quantities. That he has been satisfied with treating this matter somewhat easily, may be inferred from the fact that he occasionally varies from himself in the course of one or two pages. Thus *ase*, "as," in selections from Dan Michel, is given (aase) on page 412, but (ase) on page 413. In an extract from Richard de Hampole, on page 414, the adverb *here* is given both as (Heer) and (Her). In a paternoster, on page 442, we find in forms of the verb *do* both (don) and (miisdoon), where, too, one is surprised to see a long quantity in the prefix *mis;* compare also (doon) on the next page. In an ave and credo, on page 443, *lauird*, "lord," is represented by (laavird), but *lauerd*, a variation of the same word, by (laverd). On the same page, the adjective *ded*, "dead," appears both as (ded) and as (deed); and the imperative of the verb *forgive* appears as (forgiiv), but the indicative as (forgiveth). In this last case, if any distinction was to be made, we might have expected (forgiv) and (forgiiveth); authority for this could be produced from the Ormulum. In the proclamation of Henry III. (1258), the ending *-liche*, = modern *-ly*, appears as (-liitshe) on page 501, but as (-litshe) on page 503.

The English language has sometimes been spoken of as having wholly lost the distinctions of vowel quantity which belonged to the Anglo-Saxon; as if it stood related to the mother language in this respect as the French is related to the Latin, or the modern to the ancient Greek. It is true that in comparing Anglo-Saxon with English, we find extensive changes of vowel quantity. Long vowels where they follow the accented syllable have been shortened almost uniformly. Thus the Anglo-Saxon *-lîce*, early English *-lîche* (-liitshe), has become *lĭ* in adjectives and adverbs of modern English. But in accented syllables, if

we mistake not, a careful comparison will show that the vowel quantity of the Anglo-Saxon has been preserved in a majority of the words which have come to us from that source. And most of the changes, whether from long to short or from short to long, can be referred to a small number of euphonic principles or tendencies. The effect of a weak *r* (before a consonant or at the end of a word) to lengthen the vowel before it, as in *far*, *aware*, *horse*, etc., is one of the most important cases. The similar lengthening before *ld* and *nd*, as in *child*, *find*, etc., is as old as the thirteenth century, being the general rule in the Ormulum; and it is a fair question whether *child* and *wild* on page 483, and *hundes*, "hounds," on page 479, should not have been given with a long vowel. Still more numerous changes have been occasioned by the tendency to lengthen the short vowel of an accented penult when separated by only one consonant sound from the following unaccented vowel. The long sounds in *water*, *naked*, *evil*, *open*, etc., owe their origin to this tendency; and so do those in *name*, *make*, *law*, *eat*, *hope*, and a multitude of others, which originally ended in an unaccented syllable. Now this tendency also is found in the Ormulum, which carries it to a greater extent even than modern English: thus, *narrow*, *heavy*, *body*, *love*, *give*, *written*, *summer*, etc., are found in the Ormulum with a long vowel in the first of their two syllables. In such cases as these, the modern English agrees with the Anglo-Saxon in using a short vowel; a fact which shows that the long vowel could not have been universal in the thirteenth century, the time of the Ormulum. We think that Mr. Ellis, who writes a long vowel in some of these words, — such as *give*, *written*, *summer*, — in other works of that century, would have done better to give them short as in Anglo-Saxon and modern English. Still less can we approve of his writing in cases where it is at variance with the Anglo-Saxon, the Ormulum, and the modern English, together; as in (wen) for *wen* (page 412), A. S. *wên*, Orm. *wenenn*, "to *ween*"; (leev) for *leve* (page 414), A. S. *lifian*, Orm. *libbenn*, "to *live*"; (gret) for *grete*, (page 479), A. S. *greát*, Orm. *græt*, "great." It is not unlikely, however, that some of these cases are mere errors of the press.

We hope that Mr. Ellis, in the parts yet to appear, may regard this matter of vowel quantity as worthy of a closer attention than he seems thus far to have given it; and may thus add to the completeness and exactness of his admirable work.

2. — *The Pope and the Council.* By JANUS. Authorized Translation from the German. London. 1869.

VIEWED as the production of a Roman Catholic, this book is one of the most remarkable events of the day; and that the author or authors are Catholics we think admits of no question. The mere assertion of Catholicism made in the Preface may pass for what it is worth, either as a statement of the truth or as a cheap device for giving increased authority and intensity to the subsequent bitter assault upon the papacy; but there are other internal evidences deserving of much more confidence. No one but a Catholic would have been likely to make the incidental allusion to the New Testament priesthood and the Eucharistic Sacrifice (p. 370), or to the infallibility of the Church universal (p. 411). Popular report attributes the work to Dr. Döllinger of Munich, and in this we feel reasonably certain that popular report is not far wrong. There are probably but few men in Europe besides himself who have at command the vast range of special erudition requisite for the preparation of such a work, which shows an easy familiarity with all the sources of church history in its minutest details. Then the care with which are pointed out (pp. 92, 97, 106) certain differences between the assertions of the present book and those expressed in his acknowledged works has, to say the least, an exceedingly suspicious look. Döllinger, moreover, is known to entertain convictions on the relations between Church and State diametrically opposed to the orthodox creed as expounded by the Roman curia and set forth in the Syllabus; and when we compare his recent manifesto on the declaration of infallibility with the arguments of "Janus," we find an identity of reasoning which leaves little doubt as to the personality lurking behind the pseudonyme.

That the book should be published anonymously is no wonder. The arm of the Pope is long, and the Christian pontiffs have not been noted in history for the forgiving temper with which they receive assaults. No more damaging assault, indeed, has been made upon the papal system and the Roman curia since the days of the Reformation, by Lutheran, Calvinist, or infidel. With an array of proof that is practically limitless and absolutely incontrovertible, the author strips the papacy of all its pretensions to authority over the Church, shows how its power was founded on forgery and consolidated by fraud; and gives, from orthodox writers of every age, ample evidence of the evil which the spiritual autocracy thus conceived in sin has wrought for the Church and for the world. From the commencement of papal ascend-

ency, in the ninth century, under Nicholas I., to the present day, he will not admit one redeeming feature in the system, but with relentless zeal he piles one citation on another, until the reader is almost ready to admit that if any human institution has been purely iniquitous and an unmitigated curse to mankind, it is the theocracy of Rome.

The book, indeed, would have been far stronger and weightier had it been less ardently controversial. The same stores of learning set forth with cool impartiality, and tempered with admissions of the benefits which unquestionably flowed from the ecclesiastical organization during the Dark Ages, would have carried conviction to many minds which now will reject them with horror. The case against the papacy is strong enough, without sketching it in unrelieved blackness. The man who hesitates between the assiduous teachings of a lifetime and growing doubts as to the sanctity of so venerable an institution as the primacy of St. Peter, is more likely to be thrust back than to be persuaded by the ardor of such passages as these: "It seemed like a Nemesis that the Popes, who since Gregory VII.'s time were so ingenious in inventing oaths to entangle men's consciences and bring everything under their own power, now themselves took oaths which they regularly broke. On the other hand, it is a riddle how the very cardinals who elected a Sixtus IV., an Innocent VII., and an Alexander VI., one after the other, and thereby broke their own oaths, could suppose a Pope would be really withheld, by swearing to certain conditions at his election, from the seductions of absolute power." (p. 211.) "It was the same everywhere; it seemed as though, through the state of things gradually brought about, and the dominant system in Rome, a new art had been discovered among men, of making corruption and vice omnipresent, and diffusing it like some subtle poison, from one centre and workshop, throughout every pore of the vast organization of the Church." (p. 341.) "Rome thus became the great school of iniquity, where a large part of the German and Italian clergy went through their apprenticeship as place-hunters, and returned home loaded with benefices and sins, as also with absolutions and indulgences." (p. 345.) These passages show the spirit of the work, and as they are unredeemed by any countervailing admissions, though they may gratify the avowed opponents of Rome, conscientious inquirers will be led to distrust, where they might by a calmer and more judicial method have been led ultimately to conviction.

This controversial ardor occasionally leads the author to do injustice to the object of his wrath, as where he assumes (pp. 235 – 237) that it was through the influence of the papal system subsequent to Gratian, in the latter half of the twelfth century, that the practice of burning

for heresy was introduced. More than a century previous, King Robert the Pious had burned heretics at Orleans and Toulouse; in 1052 the Emperor Henry the Black had executed them at Goslar; and in 1146, while certain heretics were on trial at Cologne, they were forcibly taken from the hands of the officials and consigned to the stake by the mob. That the Church was indirectly responsible for all this there can be no doubt, but the inferences which "Janus" draws from the history of persecution are not perfectly true. So in respect to the project of reformation put forth under the orders of Paul III., in 1538, by a commission at the head of which was Cardinal Caraffa, our author repeats the story which has been so often told with delight by Protestant writers, that when Caraffa became Pope, under the name of Paul IV., he put his own work into the Index. (p. 233.) The truth is that the report of the commission was so bold and outspoken an avowal of the sins of the Church, that Luther immediately translated it, and it was circulated vigorously by the reformers, accompanied with notes and elucidations that were in the highest degree distasteful to the court of Rome, so that Caraffa prohibited it "cum notis vel præfationibus hæreticorum." The "heroism" which "Janus" sarcastically attributes to him for thus condemning his own work is therefore not wholly deserved.

The book has evidently been put together in much haste, to meet an approaching exigency, and thus it presents an occasional flaw which would not have escaped so acute an eye as the author undoubtedly possesses, had he enjoyed the opportunity of leisurely revision. Thus, (p. 81) he says that the Bishops of Rome in primitive times could exclude no one from the communion of the Church universal. If he had stated that the Roman bishops enjoyed no pre-eminent prerogative in this respect, he would have been correct; but the fact is that they enjoyed, in theory at least, the power to separate offenders from the whole Church, — a power likewise exercised by every bishop. In principle, no one who had been excommunicated by one bishop could be received in communion by any other, and this rule, though often violated, was always proclaimed as in force. More extraordinary is the assertion that the segregation of the excommunicated from intercourse with the faithful was first suggested in the Isidorian forgeries, and was not enforced until the time of Gregory VII. (p. 120), since such segregation was enjoined by the earliest codes of discipline that have come down to us, was practised in the Church at the time, and was vigorously enforced by Charlemagne. He seems (pp. 162, 254) to assume that the application of the text of St. Paul, "the spiritual man judges all things," as giving an indefinite jurisdiction to the Church, was reserved for Boniface VIII.

in his bull "Unam Sanctam" in 1303, when it was already used for that purpose in the ninth century, in the additions to the Carolingian Capitularies. So in alluding to the fifth Lateran Council, in 1516, he gives the reader to understand that then for the first time was asserted and enforced the freedom of the clergy from secular jurisdiction, though clerical immunity had been claimed and enjoyed, with more or less interruption, for nearly a thousand years. Somewhat incomprehensible is the assertion (p. 206) that the Hildebrandine school of canonists, Anselm of Lucca, Gregory of Pavia, etc., "were thereby laying the axe to the root of the Roman Primacy," when no proof or explanation of the statement is advanced, and elsewhere (pp. 101 – 146) it is shown, by an elaborate and exceedingly interesting investigation of their collections of canons, that the forgeries they invented, or indorsed and wrought into shape, were the most powerful aids to the establishment of the papal supremacy.

These are but trivial evidences of haste, however, and are of little moment; but the argument of the book is fatally defective. The Roman system has been too cunningly built up to be overthrown by mere evidences of its aberrations and of the evils which have been inseparable from its practical working. It is the logical deduction from premises, and those premises "Janus" admits in his Preface: "Every faithful Catholic is convinced — and to that conviction the authors of this book profess their adherence — that the primacy rests on divine appointment. The Church from the first was founded upon it, and the Lord of the Church ordained its type in the person of Peter. . . . . The ancient Church found the need of a centre of unity, of a bishop possessed of primatial authority, to whom the oppressed might turn, and by whose powerful intercession they might obtain justice." (pp. xxi, xxii.) Admitting this, everything is admitted, even the infallibility claimed by Pius IX. in his Encyclical "Qui Pluribus" of November 9, 1846: "God himself has established a living authority to fix and teach the true and legitimate sense of his divine revelation, and by his infallible judgment to put an end to all controversies, whether on faith or morals. . . . . This living and infallible authority is only to be found in force in that Church which Christ built on Peter, the chief, the prince, and the shepherd of the whole Church, to whom he promised that his faith should never fail, — the Church so constituted that she always has at her head and in her immovable throne her legitimate pontiffs, who, ascending by uninterrupted succession to the Apostle Peter, enjoy with him the same heritage of dignity, of honor, and of power, without a rival."

It is needless to say that the whole tenor of the book is directed to proving that all these claims are baseless, but the admission once made

that the primitive Church was founded on the see of St. Peter, which had by Divine appointment a tangible primacy of power and enjoyed supreme jurisdiction, is fatal to the whole argument. It may be a curious speculation to trace, as the author has done, how the papal autocracy was gradually evolved; how it broke down the autonomy of the episcopate, and swallowed up in its own *mare magnum* all rights, privileges, and prerogatives; how one forgery after another, fabrications, falsifications, and interpretations, were invented to support its pretensions, from the pretended excommunication of Arcadius by Innocent I. down to the mutilation and alteration of the breviary, in the seventeenth century, — all this is highly interesting, but it is a mere archæological investigation. If St. Peter was set over the Church by Divine appointment, and as the prototype of his successors, whose primatial authority was a refuge for the oppressed throughout the Church, the Pope is empowered to speak in the name of God, and the development of his prerogative into autocracy is merely a question of time, dependent on human ambition and unscrupulousness. "Janus," therefore, has deprived himself of the right to say (p. 182), "It is a psychological marvel how this unnatural theory of a priestly domination, embracing the whole world, controlling and subjugating the whole of life, could ever have become established." Such a domination was the natural result of what he calls the "New Testament priesthood," gifted with supernatural powers through the Eucharist, and subjected to a primate clothed with Divine authority. Once grant the power of the keys and papal representation of St. Peter, and the psychological marvel disappears.

This vital error leads the author into others, which, though not of equal moment, are yet important. Conceding the primitive papal domination, it becomes necessary for him to assume that it once existed within a church such as he regards as the ideal, and thus he is led to attribute the organization of its forces to a much later period than really was the case. In truth, the hardening process which led the Church to exercise absolute domination over its members took place at a very early period, much earlier than most ecclesiastical historians seem willing to admit; and thus it was fully prepared to avail itself of the opportunities afforded by the anarchy of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, for the extension of its control over the souls of men until it controlled their bodies and their substance likewise. Another error, indirectly arising from the same source, is the effort to show that the papal system alone was responsible for the evils of the Church. There was constant action and reaction; and it should not be forgotten, as "Janus" apparently does, that the Pseudo-Isidore, the great fundamental

forgery, to which the papacy owed everything, was fabricated in France, independently of papal suggestion, and was tendered to the Roman pontiff by ambitious Gallican prelates. Stern and self-denying virtue might have refused the splendid gift, if critics had been at hand to demonstrate its spuriousness; but in that age, when all the relations between Church and State and people were shifting and unsettled, it would have been asking too much of Gregory IV. or Nicholas I. to expect them to reject the proffered domination over the earth.

Yet, with these and some other drawbacks, the book is a most valuable and timely one. We do not know where else the student could look for a rapid and yet minute and searching account of the various forgeries which form so important and so curious a portion of the history of the Latin Church. Our author traces them pitilessly from their active commencement in the fourth and fifth centuries to the donation of Constantine; then through the Isidorian decretals, the fresh falsehoods of the decretalists from Anselm of Lucca to Gratian, the fabrications of passages from the Greek fathers on which St. Thomas Aquinas erected his structure of papal autocracy, the falsifications of the papal historians, the unscrupulousness of the commentators on the canon law, and all the other mystifications which have rendered orthodox Church history and jurisprudence a mass of fraud and deceit for which a parallel may vainly be sought. If "Janus" had rendered no other service, he would have earned the thanks of all students for thus compressing the results of wide and various study into a concise and intelligible form.

The book is so good a book that it deserved a better translator. His style is slovenly and sloppy to the last degree. He calls "penitentials" "penitentiaries"; he speaks of "home-baked arguments," and talks of a doctrine being "received by pretty well the whole order." It would be difficult, indeed, to conceive of a more faulty and hopelessly confused arrangement of sentences than that in which he sometimes indulges himself. "In their interest, and to satisfy their wants, the order of the Church had to be disintegrated, heaping incompatible offices on one person to be allowed, and the system of increasing the revenues of the *curia* by simony to be constantly extended. It was they who lived and battened on the grasping corruption of the Church." (p. 212.)

It would be an error to anticipate great and immediate results from the dissidence of men even so eminent as Dr. Döllinger and Père Hyacinthe. The Council will probably obey the mandates of the head of the Church, adopt the Syllabus as sound doctrine, and proclaim papal infallibility in a form slightly modified to satisfy recalcitrants, but yet

sufficiently distinct to allow the casuists of the curia to draw from it all the deductions they desire. That there is a large portion of the intellectual members of the Church who will be disgusted with such results there is no doubt, and they will be driven into schism more or less open. But the Church can do without them; in fact, the ruling clique would rather have them for avowed enemies than professed friends. The organization of the Church is as strong as, perhaps stronger than, ever, and the cohesive power of such an organization is incalculable. We see political parties in our own country so thoroughly under control that thousands of their numbers constantly vote for men whom they despise and measures which they detest. If this can be the case in an enlightened community, where every man is as free as air to follow his judgment or his caprices, how infinitely stronger must be the allegiance which binds the faithful to the Church, and how impregnable the organization which has been moulded by the craft and skill of ages. Every ecclesiastic is bound to his immediate superior by ties which none but the strongest can break; all work for a common end under perfect military discipline; and the mass of vested interests which have grown up around them renders every man the personal foe of any rebellious spirit.

The Church lived through the Reformation, — not only lived, but perfected and strengthened its organization; and it is to-day stronger and more hopeful than it has been since the assembling of the Council of Trent. So powerful, indeed, is its constitution, that the revolt of the half of Europe would not have even brought about a purification of its internal corruptions, had not a large portion of its temporal possessions been successively wrenched away, and thus limited the wealth which had been its curse. As it has been, so it will be. The Council, under the reckless lead of the Jesuits, may commit absurdities which will drive from the Church its most enlightened members and embroil the hierarchy with half the monarchs of Europe, but for all that the infallibility of the Pope, if decreed by the Council, will be accepted by a hundred and ninety millions of Catholics.

---

3. — *Library of Old Authors. Remains of the Early Popular Poetry of England: collected and edited, with Illustrations and Notes.* By W. Carew Hazlitt, of the Inner Temple, Barrister at Law. London: John Russell Smith. 4 vols. 1864–1866.

Time brings to obscure authors an odd kind of reparation, an immortality, not of love and interest and admiration, but of curiosity merely.

In proportion as their language was uncouth, provincial, or even barbarous, their value becomes the greater. A book of which only a single copy escaped its natural enemies, the pastry-cook and trunk-maker, may contain one word that makes daylight in some dark passage of a great author, and its name shall accordingly live forever in a note. Is not, then, a scholiastic athanasy better than none? And if literary vanity survive death, or even worse, as Brunetto Latini's made him insensible for a moment to the rain of fire and the burning sand, the authors of such books as are not properly literature may still comfort themselves with a *non omnis moriar*, laying a mournful emphasis on the adjective, and feeling that they have not lived wholly in vain while they share with the dodo a fragmentary continuance on earth. After all, the immortality, such as it is, belongs less to themselves than to the famous men they help to illustrate. If they escape oblivion, it is by a back door, as it were, and they survive only in fine print at the page's foot. At the banquet of fame they sit below the salt. And yet sometimes the barnacles that have attached themselves to the stately keels of Dante or Shakespeare or Milton have an interest of their own by letting us know in what remote waters those hardy navigators went a pearl-fishing. Has not Mr. Dyce traced Shakespeare's "dusty death" to Anthony Copley, and Milton's "back resounded Death" to Abraham Fraunce? Nay, is it not Bernard de Ventadour's lark that sings forever in the diviner air of Dante's Paradise?

> "Quan vey laudeta mover
> De joi sas alas contra'l rai,
> Que s'oblida e s laissa cazer
> Per la doussor qu 'al cor li 'n vai."

> "Qual lodoletta che in aere si spazia,
> Prima cantando, e poi tace contenta
> Dell' ultima dolcezza che la sazia."

We are not sure that Bernard's "Que s'oblida e s laissa cazer" is not sweeter than Dante's "tace contenta," but it was plainly the *doussor* that gave its cue to the greater poet's memory, and he has improved on it with that exquisite *ultima*, as his master Virgil sometimes did on Homer.

There is scarcely any rubbish-heap of literature out of which something precious may not be raked by the diligent explorer, and the late Mr. Dyce, since Gifford, the best editor of our literature of the Tudor and Jacobean periods, might well be called the Golden Dustman, so many were the precious trifles sifted out by his intelligent industry. It would not be easy to name any work more thoroughly done than his edition of Skelton. He was not a philologist in the stricter sense, but no man had such a commonplace-book as he, or knew so exactly the

meaning with which words were used during the period he did so much to illustrate. Elegant scholarship is not often, as in him, patient of drudgery and conscientious in painstaking. Between such a man and Mr. Carew Hazlitt the contrast is by no means agreeable. The one was not more distinguished by modest accuracy than the other is by the rash conceit of that half-knowledge which is more mischievous in an editor than downright ignorance. This language is strong because it is true, though we should not have felt called upon to use it, but for the vulgar flippancy with which Mr. Hazlitt alludes depreciatingly to the labors of his predecessors, — to such men as Ritson, Utterson, Wright, and Sir Frederick Madden, his superiors in everything that goes to the making of a good editor. Most of them are now dead and nailed in their chests, and it is not for us to forget the great debt we owe to them, and others like them, who first opened paths for us through the tangled wilderness of our early literature. A modern editor, with his ready-made helps of glossary, annotation, and comment, should think rather of the difficulties than the defects of these pioneers. Because *he* can bowl along a macadamized highway, there is all the more reason why he should gratefully bear in mind the Irish couplet,

> "If you 'd seen these roads before they were made,
> You 'd have held up your hands and blest General Wade."

How different is Mr. Hazlitt's spirit from that of the thorough and therefore modest scholar! In the Preface to his *Altenglische Sprachproben*, Mätzner says of an editor, *das Beste was er ist verdankt er Andern*, an accidental pentameter that might seem to have dropped out of *Nathan der Weise*. Mr. Hazlitt would profit much by getting some friend to translate for him the whole paragraph in which it occurs.

We see it announced that Mr. Hazlitt is to superintend a new edition of Warton's History of English Poetry, and are pained to think of the treatment that robust scholar and genial poet is likely to receive at the hands of an editor without taste, discrimination, or learning. Of his taste a single specimen may suffice. He tells us that "in an artistic and constructive point of view, the *Mylner of Abington* is superior to its predecessor," that predecessor being Chaucer's *Reve's Tale*, which, with his usual inaccuracy, he assigns to the *Miller!* Of his discrimination we have a sufficient test in the verses he has fathered upon Herrick in a late edition of the most graceful of our lyric poets. Perhaps discrimination is not, after all, the right word, for we have sometimes seen cause to doubt whether Mr. Hazlitt ever reads carefully the very documents he prints. For example, in the Biographical Notice prefixed to the Herrick he says (p. xvii): "Mr. W. Perry Herrick has plausibly suggested that the payments made by Sir William to his nephew were

simply on account of the fortune which belonged to Robert in right of his father, and which his uncle held in trust; this was about £400; and I think from allusions in the letters printed elsewhere that this view may be the correct one." *May* be! The poet says expressly, "I entreat you out of *my little possession* to deliver to this bearer the *customarye* £10, without which I cannot meate [?] my ioyrney." The words we have italicized are conclusive. By the way, Mr. Hazlitt's wise-looking query after "meate" is conclusive also as to his fitness for editorship. Did he never hear of the familiar phrase "to *meet* the expense"? If so trifling a misspelling can mystify him, what must be the condition of his mind in face of the more than Protean travesties which words underwent before they were uniformed by Johnson and Walker? Mr. Hazlitt's mind, to be sure, like the wind Cecias, always finds its own fog. In another of Herrick's letters we find, "For what her monie can be effected (*sic*) when there is diuision 'twixt the hart and hand"? "Her monie" of course means *harmonie*, and *effected* is therefore right. What Mr. Hazlitt may have meant by his "(*sic*)" it were idle to inquire.

We have formerly had occasion to examine some of Mr. Hazlitt's work,* and we are sorry to say that in the four volumes before us we find no reason for changing our opinion of his utter disqualification for the duties of editorship. He seldom clears up a real difficulty (never, we might say, with lights of his own), he frequently creates a darkness where none was before, and the peculiar *bumptiousness* of his incapacity makes it particularly offensive. We shall bring a few instances in proof of what we assert, our only embarrassment being in the superabundance of our material. In the Introduction to the second volume of his collection, Mr. Hazlitt speaks of "the utter want of common care on the part of previous editors of our old poetry." Such oversights as he has remarked upon in his notes are commonly errors of the press, a point on which Mr. Hazlitt, of all men, should have been charitable, for his own volumes are full of them. We call his attention to one such which is rather amusing. In his "additional notes" we find "line 77, *wylle*. Strike out the note upon this word; but the explanation is correct. *Be wroght* was a misprint, however, for *he wroght*." The error occurs in a citation of three lines in which *lother* is still left for *tother*. The original note affords us so good an example of Mr. Hazlitt's style of editing as to be worth preserving. In the "Kyng and the Hermit" we read, —

> "He ne wyst w[h]ere that he was
> Ne out of the forest for to passe,
> And thus he rode all wylle."

And here is Mr. Hazlitt's annotation on the word *wylle*: —

* North American Review, No. CCIV. p. 210 *seq.*

"*i. e.* evil. In a MS. of the *Tale of the Basyn*, supposed by Mr. Wright, who edited it in 1836, to be written in the Salopian dialect, are the following lines: —

> 'The lother hade litull thoght,
> Off husbandry cowth he noght,
> But alle his wyves *will* be wroght.'" — Vol. I. p. 16.

It is plain that he supposed *will*, in this very simple passage, to mean *evil!* This he would seem to rectify, but at the same time takes care to tell us that "the explanation [of *wylle*] is correct." He is willing to give up one blunder, if only he may have one left to comfort himself withal! *Wylle* is simply a rhyming fetch for *wild*, and the passage means that the king rode at random. The use of *wild* with this meaning is still common in such phrases as "he struck wild." In "Havelok" we find it in the nearly related sense of *being at a loss, knowing not what to do*: —

> "To lincolne barfot he yede
> Hwan he kam ther he was ful *wil*,
> Ne hauede he no frend to gangen til."

All wylle, in short, means the kind of editing that is likely to be done by a gentleman who picks up his misinformation as he goes along. We would hint that a person must know *something* before he can use even a glossary with safety.

In the "King and the Barker," when the tanner finds out that it is the king whom he has been treating so familiarly, and falls upon his knees, Mr. Hazlitt prints,

> "He had no meynde of hes hode, nor cape, ne radell,"

and subjoins the following note: "Radell, or raddle, signifies a side of a cart; but here, apparently, stands for the cart itself. Ritson printed *ner adell*." Mr. Hazlitt's explanation of *raddle*, which he got from Halliwell, is incorrect. The word, as its derivation (from O. F. *rastel*) implies, means the side or end of a *hay*-cart, in which the uprights are set like the teeth of a rake. But what has a cart to do here? There is perhaps a touch of what an editor of old doggerel would benignantly call humor, in the tanner's forgetfulness of his raiment, but the cart is as little to the purpose as one of Mr. Hazlitt's own notes. The tanner was on horseback, as the roads of the period required that he should be, and good old Ritson was plainly on the right track in his reading, though his text was muddled by a misprint. As it was, he got *one* word right, and so far has the advantage of Mr. Hazlitt. The true reading is, of course, *ner a dell*, never a deal, not a whit. The very

phrase occurs in another poem which Mr. Hazlitt has reprinted in his collection, —

> "For *never a dell*
> He wyll me love agayne." — Vol. III. p. 2.

That *adell* was a misprint in Ritson is proved by the fact that the word does not appear in his glossary. If we were to bring Mr. Hazlitt to book for his misprints! In the poem we have just quoted he gravely prints,

> "Matter in dede,
> My sides did blede,"

for "mother, indede," "through ryght wysenes" for "though ryghtwisenes," "with man vnkynde" for "sith man vnkynde," "ye knowe a parte" for "ye knowe aperte," "here in" for "herein," all of which make nonsense, and all come within the first one hundred and fifty lines, and those of the shortest, mostly of four syllables each. Perhaps they rather prove ignorance than want of care. One blunder falling within the same limits we have reserved for special comment, because it affords a good example of Mr. Hazlitt's style of editing: —

> "Your herte souerayne
> Clouen in twayne
> By longes the blynde." — Vol. III. p. 7.

Here the uninstructed reader would be as completely in the dark as to what *longes* meant as the editor plainly was himself. The old rhymer no doubt wrote Longis, meaning thereby Longinus, a personage familiar enough, one should think, to any reader of mediæval poetry. Mr. Hazlitt absolves himself for not having supplied a glossary by the plea that none is needed by the class of readers for whom his volumes are intended. But this will hardly seem a valid excuse for a gentleman who often goes out of his way to explain in his notes such simple matters as that "shape" means "form," and that "Johan of the golden mouthe" means "St. Chrysostom," which, indeed, it does not, any more than Johannes Baptista means St. Baptist. We will supply Mr. Hazlitt with an illustration of the passage from Bekker's *Ferabras*, the more willingly as it may direct his attention to a shining example of how an old poem should be edited: —

> "en la crotz vos pendero li fals Iuzieu truan,
> can Longis vos ferie de sa lansa trencan:
> el non avia vist en trastot son vivan;
> lo sanc li venc per l'asta entro al punh colan;
> e [el] toquet ne sos huelhs si vic el mantenan."

Mr. Hazlitt, to be sure (who prints *sang parlez* for *sanz parler*) (Vol. I. p. 265), will not be able to form any notion of what these verses

mean, but perhaps he will be able to draw an inference from the capital L that *longes* is a proper name. The word *truan* at the end of the first verse of our citation may also suggest to him that *truant* is not quite so satisfactory an explanation of the word *trewāt* as he seems to think. (Vol. IV. p. 24, *note.*) In deference to Mr. Hazlitt's presumed familiarity with an author sometimes quoted by him in his notes, we will point him to another illustration: —

> "Ac ther cam forth a knyght,
> With a kene spere y-grounde
> Highte Longeus, as the lettre telleth,
> And longe hadde lore his sighte."
>
> *Piers Ploughman*, Wright, p. 374.

Mr. Hazlitt shows to peculiar advantage where old French is in question. Upon the word *Osyll* he favors us with the following note: "The blackbird. In East Cornwall *ozell* is used to signify the windpipe, and thence the bird may have had its name, as Mr. Couch has suggested to me." (Vol. II. p. 25.) Of course the blackbird, alone among fowls, is distinguished by a windpipe! The name is merely another form of O. F. *oisil*, and was usurped naturally enough by one of the commonest birds, just as *pajaro* (L. *passer*) in Spanish, by a similar process in the opposite direction, came to mean bird in general. On the very next page he speaks of "the Romance which is vulgarly entitled *Lybeaus Disconus*, i. e. *Le Beau Disconnu*." If he had corrected *Disconus* to *Desconus*, all had been well; but *Disconnu* neither is nor ever was French at all. Where there is blundering to be done, one stone often serves Mr. Hazlitt for two birds. *Ly beaus Disconus* is perfectly correct old French, and another form of the adjective (*bius*) perhaps explains the sound we give to the first syllable of *beauty* and *Beaufort*. A barrister at law, as Mr. Hazlitt is, may not be called on to know anything about old English or modern French, but we might fairly expect him to have at least a smattering of Law French! In volume fourth, page 129, a goodman trying his wife,

> "Bad her take the pot that sod ouer the fire
> And set it abooue vpon the astire."

Mr. Hazlitt's note upon *astire* is "hearth, i. q. *astre*." Knowing that the modern French was *âtre*, he too rashly inferred a form which never existed except in Italian. The old French word is *aistre* or *estre*, but Mr. Hazlitt, as usual, prefers something that is neither old French nor new. We do not pretend to know what *astire* means, but a hearth that should be *abooue* the pot seething over the fire would be unusual, to say the least, in our semi-civilized country.

In the "Lyfe of Roberte the Deuill" (Vol. I. p. 232), Mr. Hazlitt twice

makes a knight *sentre* his lance, and tells us in a note that the "Ed. 1798 has *fentered*," a very easy misprint for the right word *feutered*. What Mr. Hazlitt supposed to be the meaning of *sentre* he has not vouchsafed to tell us. *Fautre* (sometimes *faltre* or *feutre*) means in old French the *rest* of a lance. Thus in the *Roman du Renart* (26517),

"Et mist sa lance sor le *fautre*."

But it also meant a peculiar *kind* of rest. In Sir F. Madden's edition of *Gawayne* (to which Mr. Hazlitt refers occasionally) we read,

"They *feutred* their lances, these knyghtes good";

and in the same editor's "William and the Werwolf,"

"With sper festened in *feuter*, him for to spille."

In a note on the latter passage Sir F. Madden says, "There seems no reason, however, why it [feuter] should not mean the rest attached to the armour." But Roquefort was certainly right in calling it a "garniture d'une selle pour tenir la lance." A spear fastened to the saddle gave more deadly weight to the blow. The "*him for to spille*" implies this. So in "Merlin" (E. E. Text Soc., p. 488): "Than thei toke speres grete and rude, and putte hem in fewtre, and that is the grettest crewelte that oon may do, ffor turnement oweth to be with-oute felonye, and they meved to smyte hem as in mortall werre." The context shows that the *fewtre* turned sport into earnest. A citation in Raynouard's *Lexique Roman* (though wrongly explained by him) directed us to a passage which proves that this particular kind of rest for the lance was attached to the saddle, in order to render the blow heavier:

"Lances *à* [lege *as*] *arçons* afeutrées
Pour plus de dures colées rendre."
Branche des Royaux Lignages, 4514, 4515.

Mr. Hazlitt, as we have said, lets no occasion slip to insinuate the inaccuracy and carelessness of his predecessors. The long and useful career of Mr. Wright, who, if he had given us nothing more than his excellent edition of "Piers Ploughman" and the volume of "Ancient Vocabularies," would have deserved the gratitude of all lovers of our literature or students of our language, does not save him from the severe justice of Mr. Hazlitt, nor is the name of Warton too venerable to be coupled with a derogatory innuendo. Mr. Wright needs no plea in abatement from us, and a mischance of Mr. Hazlitt's own has comically avenged Warton. The word *prayer*, it seems, had somehow substituted itself for *prayse* in a citation by Warton of the title of the "Schole-House of Women." Mr. Hazlitt thereupon takes occasion to charge him

with often "speaking at random," and after suggesting that it might have been the blunder of a copyist, adds, "or it is by no means impossible that Warton himself, having been allowed to inspect the production, was guilty of this oversight." (Vol. IV. p. 98.) Now, on the three hundred and eighteenth page of the same volume, Mr. Hazlitt has allowed the following couplet to escape his conscientious attention: —

> "Next, that no gallant should not ought suppose
> That *prayers* and glory doth consist in cloathes."

Lege, nostro periculo, PRAYSE! Were dear old Tom still on earth, he might light his pipe cheerfully with any one of Mr. Hazlitt's pages, secure that in so doing he was consuming a brace of blunders at the least. The word *prayer* is an unlucky one for Mr. Hazlitt. In the "Knyght and his Wyfe" (Vol. II. p. 18) he prints: —

> "And sayd, Syre, I rede we make
> In this chapel oure prayers,
> That God us kepe both in ferrus."

Why did not Mr. Hazlitt, who explains so many things that everybody knows, give us a note upon *in ferrus?* It would have matched his admirable elucidation of *waygose*, which we shall notice presently. Is it not barely possible that the MS. may have read *prayere* and *in fere? Prayere* occurs two verses further on, and not as a rhyme.

Mr. Hazlitt even sets Sir Frederick Madden right on a question of Old English grammar, telling him superciliously that *can*, with an infinitive, in such phrases as *he can go*, is used not "to denote a *past* tense, but an *imperfect* tense." By *past* we suppose him to mean *perfect*. But even if an imperfect tense were not a past one, we can show by a passage in one of the poems in this very collection that *can*, in the phrases referred to, sometimes not only denotes a past but a perfect tense: —

> "And thorow that worde y felle in pryde;
> As the aungelle can of hevyn glyde,
> And with the tywnkling* of an eye
> God for-dud alle that maystrye
> And so hath he done for my gylte."

Now the angel here is Lucifer, and *can of hevyn glyde* means simply *fell from heaven*, not *was falling*. It is in the same tense as *for-dud* in the next line. The fall of the angels is surely a *fait accompli*. In the last line, by the way, Mr. Hazlitt changes "my for" to "for my," and wrongly, the *my* agreeing with *maystrye* understood. In modern English

---

* The careless Ritson would have printed this *twynkling*.

we should use *mine* in the same way. But Sir Frederick Madden can take care of himself.

We have less patience with Mr. Hazlitt's impertinence to Ritson, a man of ample reading and excellent taste in selection, and who, real scholar as he was, always drew from original sources. We have a *foible* for Ritson with his oddities of spelling, his acerb humor, his unconsciously depreciatory mister Tyrwhitts and mister Bryants, and his obstinate disbelief in doctor Percy's folio manuscript. Above all, he was a most conscientious editor, and an accurate one so far as was possible with the lights of that day. Mr. Hazlitt has reprinted two poems, "The Squyr of Low Degre" and "The Knight of Curtesy," which had already been edited by Ritson. The former of these has passages that are unsurpassed in simple beauty by anything in our earlier poetry. The author of it was a good versifier, and Ritson, though he corrected some glaring errors, did not deal so trenchantly with verses manifestly lamed by the copyist as perhaps an editor should.* Mr. Hazlitt says of Ritson's text, that "it offers more than *an hundred* departures from the original," and of the "Knight of Courtesy," that "Ritson's text is by no means accurate." Now Mr. Hazlitt has adopted nearly all of Ritson's emendations, without giving the least hint of it. On the contrary, in some five or six instances, he gives the original reading in a foot-note with an "old ed. has" so and so, thus leaving the reader to infer that the corrections were his own. Where he has not followed Ritson, he has almost uniformly blundered, and that through sheer ignorance. For example, he prints,

"Alas! it tourned to *wroth her heyle,*"

where Ritson had substituted *wrotherheyle.* The measure shows that Ritson was right. *Wroth her heyle*, moreover, is nonsense. It should have been *wrother her heyle* at any rate, but the text is far too modern to admit of that archaic form. In the "Debate of the Body and the Soul" (Mätzner's A. E. Sprachproben, 103) we have,

"Why schope thou me to wrother-hele,"

and in "Dame Siris" (Ibid., 110),

"To goder hele ever came thou hider."

Mr. Hazlitt prints,

"For yf it may be found in thee
That thou them [de]fame for enuyte."

---

* For example:—

"And in the arber was a tre
A fairer in the world might none be,"

should certainly read,

"None fairer in the world might be."

The emendation [de] is Ritson's, and is probably right, though it would require, for the metre's sake, the elision of *that* at the beginning of the verse. But what is *enuyte?* Ritson reads *enmyte*, which is, of course, the true reading. Mr. Hazlitt prints (as usual either without apprehending or without regarding the sense),

> "With browes *bent* and eyes full mery,"

where Ritson has *brent*, and gives parallel passages in his note on the word. Mr. Hazlitt gives us

> "To here the bugles there yblow,
> With their *bugles* in that place,"

though Ritson had made the proper correction to *begles*. Mr. Hazlitt, with ludicrous *nonchalance*, allows the Squire to press into the throng

> "With a *bastard* large and longe,"

and that with the right word (*baslarde*) staring him in the face from Ritson's text. We wonder he did not give us an illustrative quotation from Falconbridge! Both editors have allowed some gross errors to escape, such as "come *not*" for "come" (v. 425); "so leue *he* be" for "ye be" (v. 593); "vnto *her* chambre" for "vnto your" (v. 993); but in general Ritson's is the better and more intelligent text of the two. In the "Knight of Curtesy," Mr. Hazlitt has followed Ritson's text almost *literatim*. Indeed, it is demonstrable that he gave it to his printers as *copy* to set up from. The proof is this: Ritson has accented a few words ending in *è*. Generally he uses the grave accent, but now and then the acute. Mr. Hazlitt's text follows all these variations exactly. The main difference between the two is that Ritson prints the first personal pronoun *i*, and Mr. Hazlitt, I. Ritson is probably right; for in the "Schole-house of Women" (vv. 537, 538) where the text no doubt was

> "i [i. e. *one*] deuil a woman to speak may constrain,
> But all that in hel be cannot let it again,"

Mr. Hazlitt changes "i" to "A," and says in a note, "Old ed. has *I*." That by his correction he should miss the point was only natural; for he evidently conceives that the *sense* of a passage does not in the least concern an editor. An instance or two will suffice. In the "Knyght and his Wyfe" (Vol. II. p. 17) we read,

> "The fynd tyl hure hade myche tene
> As hit was a sterfull we seme!"

Mr. Hazlitt in a note explains *tene* to mean "trôuble or sorrow"; but if that were its meaning here, we should read *made*, and not *hade*, which would give to the word its other sense of *attention*. The last verse of

the couplet Mr. Hazlitt seems to think perfectly intelligible as it stands. We should not be surprised to learn that he looked upon it as the one gem that gave lustre to a poem otherwise of the dreariest. We fear we shall rob it of all its charm for him by putting it into modern English: —

"As it was after full well seen."

So in the "Smyth and his Dame" (Vol. III. p. 204) we read,

"It were a lytele maystry
To make a blynde man to se,"

instead of "*as* lytell." It might, indeed, be as easy to perform the miracle on a blind man as on Mr. Hazlitt. Again, in the same poem, a little further on,

"For I tell the now trevely,
Is none so wyse ne *to* sle,
But ever *ye* may som what lere,"

which, of course, should be,

"ne *so* sle
But ever *he* may som what lere."

Worse than all, Mr. Hazlitt tells us (Vol. I. p. 158) that when they bury the great Khan, they lay his body in a tabernacle,

"With sheld and spere and other wede
With a whit mere to gyf him in ylke."

We will let Sir John Mandeville correct the last verse: "And they seyn that when he shale come into another World . . . . the mare schalle *gheven him mylk*." Mr. Hazlitt gives us some wretched doggerel by "Piers of Fulham," and gives it swarming with blunders. We take at random a couple of specimens: —

"And loveship goith ay to warke
Where that presence is put a bake," (Vol. II. pp. 13, 14,)

where we should read "love's ship," "wrake," and "abake." Again, just below,

"Ffor men haue seyn here to foryn,
That love laughet when men be forsworn."

Love should be "Iove." Ovid is the obscure person alluded to in the "men here to foryn";

Jupiter e cœlo perjuria ridet amantum.

We dare say Mr. Hazlitt, if he ever read the passage, took it for granted that "to foryn" meant *too foreign*, and gave it up in despair. But surely Shakespeare's

"At lovers' perjuries,
They say, Jove laughs,"

is not too foreign to have put him on the right scent.

Mr. Hazlitt is so particular in giving us *v* for *u* and *vice versa*, that such oversights are a little annoying. Every man his own editor seems to be his theory of the way in which old poetry should be reprinted. On this plan, the more riddles you leave (or make) for the reader to solve, the more pleasure you give him. To correct the blunders in any book edited by Mr. Hazlitt would give the young student a pretty thorough training in archaic English. In this sense the volumes before us might be safely recommended to colleges and schools. When Mr. Hazlitt undertakes to correct, he is pretty sure to go wrong. For example, in "Doctour Doubble Ale" (Vol. III. p. 309) he amends thus:

> "And sometyme mikle strife is
> Among the ale wyfes, [y-wis];

where the original is right as it stands. Just before, in the same poem, we have a parallel instance: —

> "And doctours dulpatis
> That falsely to them pratis,
> And bring them to the gates."

The original probably reads (or should read) *wyfis* and *gatis*. But it is too much to expect of Mr. Hazlitt that he should remember the very poems he is editing from one page to another, nay, as we shall presently show, that he should even read them. He will change *be* into *ben* where he should have let it alone (though his own volumes might have furnished him with such examples as "were go," "have se," "is do," and fifty more), but he will sternly retain *bene* where the rhyme requires *be*, and Ritson had so printed. In "Adam Bel" the word *pryme* occurs (Vol. II. p. 140), and he vouchsafes us the following note: "i. e. noon. It is commonly used by early writers in this sense. In the *Four* P. P., by John Heywood, circa 1540, the apothecary says

> 'If he taste this boxe nye aboute the pryme
> By the masse, he is in heven or even songe tyme.'"

Let our readers admire with us the easy "it is commonly used" of Mr. Hazlitt, as if he had store of other examples in his note-book. He could an if he would! But unhappily he borrowed this single quotation from Nares, and, as usual, it throws no scintilla of light upon the point in question, for his habit in annotation is to find by means of a glossary some passage (or passages, if possible) in which the word to be explained occurs, and then — why, then to give the word as an explanation of itself. But in this instance, Mr. Hazlitt, by the time he had reached the middle of his next volume (Vol. III. p. 281) had wholly forgotten that *pryme* was "commonly used by early writers" for *noon*, and in a note on the following passage,

"I know not whates a clocke
But by the countre cocke,
The mone nor yet the pryme,
Vntyll the sonne do shyne,"

he informs us that it means "six o'clock in the morning"! Here again this editor, who taxes Ritson with want of care, prints *mone* for *none* in the very verse he is annotating, and which we may therefore presume that he had read. A man who did not know the moon till the sun showed it him is a match even for Mr. Hazlitt himself. We wish it were as easy as he seems to think it to settle exactly what *pryme* means when used by our "early writers," but it is at least absolutely certain that it did not mean *noon*.

But Mr. Hazlitt, if these volumes are competent witnesses, knows nothing whatever about English, old or new. In the "Mery Jest of Dane Hew" he finds the following verses,

"Dame he said what shall we now doo
Sir she said so mote go
The munk in a corner ye shall lay"

which we print purposely without punctuation. Mr. Hazlitt prints them thus,

"Dame, he said, what shall we now doo?
Sir, she said, so mote [it] go.
The munk," &c.,

and gives us a note on the locution he has invented to this effect, "? so might it be managed." And the Chancellor said, *I doubt!* Mr. Hazlitt's query makes such a singular exception to his more natural mood of immediate inspiration that it is almost pathetic. The amended verse, as everybody (not confused by too great familiarity with our "early writers") knows, should read,

"Sir, she said, so might I go,"

and should be followed only by a comma, to show its connection with the next. The phrase "so mote I go," is as common as a weed in the works of the elder poets, both French and English; it occurs several times in Mr. Hazlitt's own collection, and its other form, "so mote I fare," which may also be found there, explains its meaning. On the phrase *point-device* (Vol. III. p. 117) Mr. Hazlitt has a positively incredible note, of which we copy only a part: "This term, which is commonly used in early poems" [mark once more his intimacy with our earlier literature] "to signify extreme exactitude, originated in the points which were marked on the astrolabe, as one of the means which the astrologers and dabblers in the black art adopted to enable them (as they pretended) to read the fortunes of those by whom they were consulted in

the stars and planetary orbs. The excessive precision which was held to be requisite in the delineation of these points" [the delineation of a *point* is good!] "&c. on the astrolabe, led to *point-device*, or points-device (as it is sometimes found spelled), being used as a proverbial expression for minute accuracy of any kind." Then follows a quotation from Gower, in which an astrolabe is spoken of "with points and cercles merveilous," and the note proceeds thus: "Shakespeare makes use of a similar figure of speech in the *Tempest*, I. 2, where the following dialogue takes place between Prospero and Ariel: —

> '*Prosp.* Hast thou, spirit,
> Performed *to point* the tempest that I bade thee?
> *Ar.* In every article.'"

Neither the proposed etymology nor the illustration requires any remark from us. We will only say that *point-device* is excellently explained and illustrated by Wedgwood.

We will give a few more examples out of many to show Mr. Hazlitt's utter unfitness for the task he has undertaken. In the "Kyng and the Hermyt" are the following verses,

> "A wyld wey, I hold, it were
> The wey to wend, I you swere,
> Bot ye the dey may se,"

meaning simply, "I think it would be a wild thing (in you) to go on your way unless you wait for daylight." Mr. Hazlitt punctuates and amends thus: —

> "A wyld wey I hold it were,
> The wey to wend, I you swere,
> Ye bot [by] the dey may se." — Vol. I. p. 19.

The word *bot* seems a stumbling-block to Mr. Hazlitt. On page 54 of the same volume we have,

> "Herd i neuere bi no leuedi
> *Hote* hendinesse and curteysi."

The use of the word *by* as in this passage would seem familiar enough, and yet in the "Hye Way to the Spittel Hous" Mr. Hazlitt explains it as meaning *be*. Any boy knows that *without* sometimes means *unless* (Fielding uses it often in that sense), but Mr. Hazlitt seems unaware of the fact. In his first volume (p. 224) he gravely prints: —

> "They trowed verelye that she shoulde dye;
> *With that* our ladye wold her helpe and spede."

The semicolon after *dye* shows that this is not a misprint, but that the editor saw no connection between the first verse and the second. In the same volume (p. 133) we have the verse,

> "He was a grete tenement man, and ryche of londe and lede,"

and to *lede* Mr. Hazlitt appends this note: "*Lede*, in early English, is found in various significations, but here stands as the plural of *lad*, a servant." In what conceivable sense is it the plural of *lad*? And does *lad* necessarily mean a servant? The *Promptorium* has *ladde* glossed by *garcio*, but the meaning *servant*, as in the parallel cases of *παις*, *puer*, *garçon*, and *boy*, was a derivative one, and of later origin. The word means simply *man* (in the generic sense) and in the plural *people*. So in the "Squyr of Low Degre,"

"I will forsake both land and *lede*,"

and in the "Smyth and his Dame,"

"That hath both land and *lyth*."

The word was *not* "used in various significations." Even so lately as "Flodden Ffeild" we find,

"He was a noble *leed* of high degree."

Connected with *land* it was a commonplace in German as well as in English. So in the *Tristan* of Godfrey of Strasburg,

„Er Bevalch ſin liv t vnde ſin lant
An ſines marſcalkes hant."

Mr. Hazlitt is more nearly right than usual when he says that in the particular case cited above *lede* means *servants*. But were these of only one sex? Does he not know that even in the middle of the last century when an English nobleman spoke of "my people," he meant simply his domestics?

Encountering the familiar phrase *No do!* (Vol. IV. p. 64), Mr. Hazlitt changes it to *Not do!* He informs us that *Goddes are* (Vol. I. p. 197) means "God's heir"! He says (Vol. II. p. 146): "*To borrow*, in the sense of *to take*, *to guard*, or *to protect*, is so common in early English that it is unnecessary to bring forward any illustration of its use in this way." But he relents, and presently gives us two from *Ralph Roister Doister*, each containing the phrase "Saint George to borrow!" That *borrow* means *take* no owner of books need be told, and Mr. Hazlitt has shown great skill in *borrowing* other people's illustrations for his notes, but the phrase he quotes has no such meaning as he gives it. Mr. Dyce in a note on Skelton explains it rightly, "St. George being my pledge or surety."

We gather a few more of these flowers of exposition and etymology: —

"The while thou sittest in chirche, thi bedys schalt thou bidde."
(Vol. I. p. 181.)

i. e. thou shalt offer thy prayers. Mr. Hazlitt's note on *bidde* is, "i. e. *bead.* So in *The Kyng and the Hermit*, line 111:—

'That herd an hermyte there within
Unto the gate he gan to wyn
Bedying his prayer.'"

Precisely what Mr. Hazlitt understands by *beading* (or indeed by anything else) we shall not presume to divine, but we *should* like to hear him translate "if any man bidde the worshyp," which comes a few lines further on. Now let us turn to page 191 of the same volume. "Maydenys ben loneliche and no thing sekir." Mr. Hazlitt tells us in a note that "sekir or sicker" is a very common form of *secure*, and quotes in illustration from the prose *Morte Arthure*, "A! said Sir Launcelot, comfort yourselfe, for it shall bee unto us as a great honour, and much more then if we died in any other places: for of death wee be *sicker*." Now in the text the word means *safe*, and in the note it means *sure*. Indeed *sure*, which is only a shorter form of *secure*, is its ordinary meaning. "I mak sicker," said Kirkpatrick, a not unfitting motto for certain editors, if they explained it in their usual phonetic way.

In the "Frere and the Boye," when the old man has given the boy a bow, he says:—

"Shote therin, whan thou good thynke;
For yf thou shote and wynke,
The prycke thow shalte hytte."

Mr. Hazlitt's explanation of *wynke* is "to close one eye in taking aim," and he quotes a passage from Gascoigne in support of it. Whatever Gascoigne meant by the word (which is very doubtful), it means nothing of the kind here, and is another proof that Mr. Hazlitt does not think it so important to understand what he reads as St. Philip did. What the old man said was, "even if you shut both your eyes, you can't help hitting the mark." So in "Piers Ploughman" (Whitaker's text),

"Wynkyng, as it were, wytterly ich saw hyt."

Again, for our editor's blunders are as endless as the heads of an old-fashioned sermon, in the "Schole-House of Women" (Vol. IV. p. 130), Mr. Hazlitt has a note on the phrase "make it nice,"

("And yet alwaies they bible bable
Of euery matter and make it nice,")

which reads thus: "To make it pleasant or *snug*. I do not remember to have seen the word used in this sense very frequently. But Gascoigne has it in a precisely similar way:—

'The glosse of gorgeous Courtes by thee did please mine eye,
A stately sight me thought it was to see the braue go by,
To see their feathers flaunte, to make [marke !] their straunge deuise,
To lie along in ladies lappes, to lispe, and make it nice.'"

To *make it nice* means nothing more nor less than to *play the fool*, or rather, to *make a fool of yourself, faire le niais*. In old English the French *niais* and *nice*, from similarity of form and analogy of meaning, naturally fused together in the word *nice*, which, by an unusual luck, has been promoted from a derogatory to a respectful sense. Gascoigne's *lispe* might have put Mr. Hazlitt on his guard, if he ever considered the sense of what he quoted. But he never does, nor of what he edits either. For example, in the "Smyth and his Dame" we find the following note: "*Prowe*, or *proffe*, is not at all uncommon as a form of *profit*. In the 'Seven Names of a Prison,' a poem printed in *Reliquiæ Antiquæ*, we have, —

'Quintum nomen istius foveæ ita probatum,
A place of *proff* for man to know bothe frend and foo.'"

Now *proff* and *prow* are radically different words. *Proff* means *proof*, and if Mr. Hazlitt had read the stanza which he quotes, he would have found (as in all the others of the same poem) the meaning repeated in Latin in the last line, *probacio amicorum*.

But we wish to leave our readers (if not Mr. Hazlitt) in good humor, and accordingly we have reserved two of his notes as *bonnes bouches*. In "Adam Bel," when the outlaws ask pardon of the king,

"They kneled downe without lettyng
And each helde vp his hande."

To this passage (tolerably plain to those not *too* familiar with "our early literature") Mr. Hazlitt appends this solemn note: "*To hold up the hand* was formerly a sign of respect or concurrence, or a mode of taking an oath; and thirdly as a signal for mercy. In all these senses it has been employed from the most ancient times; nor is it yet out of practice, as many savage nations still testify their respect to a superior by holding their hand [either *their hands* or *the hand*, Mr. Hazlitt!] over their head. *Touching the hat* appears to be a vestige of the same custom. In the present passage the three outlaws may be understood to kneel on approaching the throne, and to hold up each a hand as a token that they desire to ask the royal clemency or favour. In the lines which are subjoined it [what?] implies a solemn assent to an oath:

'This swore the duke and all his men,
And all the lordes that with him lend,
And tharto to* held they up thaire hand.'"
Minot's Poems, ed. 1825, p. 9.

* The *to* is, we need not say, an addition of Mr. Hazlitt's. What faith can we put in the texts of a man who so often copies even his quotations inaccurately?

The admirable Tupper could not have done better than this, even so far as the mere English of it is concerned. Where all is so fine, we hesitate to declare a preference, but, on the whole, must give in to the passage about *touching the hat*, which is as good as "mobbled queen." The Americans are still among the "savage nations" who "imply a solemn assent to an oath," by holding up the hand. Mr. Hazlitt does not seem to know that the question whether to kiss the book or hold up the hand was once a serious one in English politics.

But Mr. Hazlitt can do better even than this! Our readers may be incredulous; but we shall proceed to show that he can. In the "Schole-House of Women," among much other equally delicate satire of the other sex (if we may venture still to call them so), the satirist undertakes to prove that woman was made, not of the rib of a man, but of a dog:—

> "And yet the rib, as I suppose,
> That God did take out of the man
> A dog vp caught, and a way gose
> Eat it clene; so that as than
> The woork to finish that God began
> Could not be, as we haue said,
> Because the dog the rib conuaid.
> A remedy God found as yet;
> Out of the dog he took a rib."

Mr. Hazlitt has a long note on *way gose*, of which the first sentence shall suffice us: "The origin of the term way-goose is involved in some obscurity." We should think so, to be sure! Let us modernize the spelling and grammar, and correct the punctuation, and then see how it looks:—

> "A dog up caught and away goes,
> Eats it up."

We will ask Mr. Hazlitt to compare the text, as he prints it, with

> "Into the hall he gose." — Vol. III. p. 67.

We should have expected a note here on the "hall he-goose." Not to speak of the point of the joke, such as it is, a goose that could eat up a man's rib could only be matched by one that could swallow such a note, — or write it!

We have made but a small florilegium from Mr. Hazlitt's remarkable volumes. His editorial method seems to have been to print as the Lord would, till his eye was caught by some word he did not understand, and then to make the reader comfortable by a note showing that the editor is as much in the dark as he. We are profoundly thankful for the omission of a glossary. It would have been a nursery and seminary of blunder. To expose pretentious charlatanry is sometimes the unpleasant duty of a reviewer. It is a duty we never seek, and

should not have assumed in this case but for the impertinence with which Mr. Hazlitt has treated dead and living scholars, the latchets of whose shoes he is not worthy to unloose, and to express their gratitude to whom is, or ought to be, a pleasure to all honest lovers of their mother-tongue. If he who has most to learn be the happiest man, Mr. Hazlitt is indeed to be envied; but we hope he will learn a great deal before he lays his prentice hands on Warton's "History of English Poetry," a classic in its own way. If he does not learn before, he will be likely to learn after, and in no agreeable fashion.

4.— *The Secret of Swedenborg: being an Elucidation of his Doctrine of the Divine Natural Humanity.* By HENRY JAMES. Boston: Fields, Osgood, & Co. 8vo. pp. 243. 1869.

THOUGH this book presents some very interesting and impressive religious views, and the spiritual tone of it is in general eminently healthy, it is altogether out of harmony with the spirit of this age. If we understand the theory which is here presented as Swedenborg's, it is essentially as follows: —

Philosophy and religion are one. The matter of deepest moment to the heart is the matter of deepest moment to the head. That root of existence for which metaphysics inquires is God. The business of philosophy is to explain the relation between being and appearing; but that which alone has existence independent of everything else is God, while all that appears is relative to the human mind, and so is only man; thus, what is and what appears are God and man, and it is the relations of God and man that philosophy has to expound.

In any real object, that is, any permanent appearance, we may distinguish two elements, the permanence and the appearance. The permanence, the reality, is called by Mr. James the *being;* the appearance or emergence into the world of phenomena is called the *existence.* This distinction is no mere logical convenience or necessity, but is a real partition, for it lies in the very *esse* of a thing. The reality is that on which the appearance is founded, and, therefore, the "being" of a thing is its creator, while the "existence" is the creature in himself. But the creature, because he does not contain within his own self the essence of his being, is, in himself, a mere phantom and no reality.

But if an underlying being is essential to existence, no less is manifestation essential to being. It can make no difference whatever whether a thing is or is not, if it is never to any mind to give any sign of its being. Hence, to *be* without being manifested is a kind of being which

does not differ from its negative, but is a meaningless form of words. Thus, it is of the very essence of being that it shall come forth into appearance, of the very essence of God that he shall create.

An appearance is only in consciousness. To create, therefore, or cause an appearance, is to awaken a consciousness, to vivify. To give being is to give life, or being is life. God's being, then, is creation; is vivifying other things, is living in others.* Now, to have one's life in others is to love. So the essence of God is love. The creature's being also lies in another, namely, in God; and, therefore, his life too is love; only as he does not confer this life upon that other, but receives it from him, it is receptive or selfish love, while the Creator's is perfect and unselfish love. Since, therefore, the Creator is perfect love, the creation is to be explained on the principle of love.

The Creator, then, cannot have made his creatures for his own sake (for love does nothing for its own sake), but for theirs. Accordingly, he must seek to make them, as much as possible, independent. As long as their being is in God, it is true that any independence they can seem to have will be a mere illusion, but that illusion God must grant. So he gives them a world of phenomena in which and relatively to which they have a reality and a self-determination.

But as all removal from God, all disparateness to his being, is mere self and nothingness, the Creator could not be satisfied with a creation which should stop short at this point, but must institute another movement in creation whereby the creature may be brought back into harmony with him, and thus really appropriate his Creator's being. This return movement is called redemption.

The machinery of this process is man's history, and is, therefore, naturally extremely complex. It has two parts, the redemption of the race, and the redemption of the private man. The redemption of the race is effected by the history of the race, by the breaking down of governmental forms, the development of the family relationship, and above all by the vicissitudes of the Church which culminate in the incarnation of our Lord. By these means a brotherhood is produced among men, such that every man without constraint obeys the laws of society. The redemption of the individual man is produced by his life and the influence of conscience, which lead him to a perception of the truths of religion. In this redemption creation reaches completion.

These things, however, are not scientifically established. Mr. James says that "no cordial lover of truth can long endure to reason about it"; and he himself is a very cordial lover of truth, in that sense. That his

* Swedenborg holds time to be an illusory appearance, and therefore it does not follow that God cannot be without at the same time creating.

doctrines are incapable of being established by reasoning is, in fact, plainly stated by him more than once. This being so, why call them philosophy? The "sanction of the heart" he rightly says is their only voucher. "We need not expect," he says, "to find Swedenborg justifying himself in a strictly ratiocinative way, or as men deal with what they feel to be matter of opinion merely, but affirmatively rather, or as what they feel to be matter of precise knowledge." This is not the language of a philosopher. Aristotle, Euclid, and Newton did not apply strict ratiocination to logic, geometry, and gravitation, because they did not feel them to be subjects of precise knowledge. What men treat by mere affirmation are matters which they do not believe will be questioned, together with such as they conceive cannot be questioned. But what is in the mind of a writer who talks of *justifying himself affirmatively?* His affirmative justification can amount to nothing but energetic assertion, or energetic denunciation of others. Hence we cannot be surprised at meeting frequently in Mr. James's writings such phrases as, "incorrigible fool," "abject blunder," "transparent quibble," "silly," "impossible for human fatuity ever to go a step farther," "these disputatious gentlemen," "not honest," "utter unscrupulous abandonment of himself to," "flat-footed and flat-headed," "wilful and wicked antediluvian," — epithets harmless enough, but not wisely applied to thoughts and men that are great historical factors.

Perhaps Mr. James is of opinion that to appeal to the "sanction of the heart" is to appeal to experience, namely, to religious experience. Anybody who can make the truth of this evident will do a good thing for religion; but, as yet, it has not been made out. The reasoning of natural science is valid because it proceeds from outward appearances only to outward appearances. If religion could, in a parallel way, restrict its conclusions to spiritual experiences, it might find a scientific foundation in spiritual experiences. But it cannot. Religion must be supreme or it is nothing. It has to assert, not only that such and such a proposition is one altogether delightful and comforting, but that outward appearances will always be found to conform to it. Religion may be made to rest on religious faith, and a philosophical justification may be given of such a procedure; but it fails to be philosophy while it appeals not to the head, but only to the heart. In saying this, we do not in the least oppose the Scotch philosophy which makes all knowledge finally to repose on what are sometimes called ultimate beliefs; because these beliefs are the common sense of mankind which belong to all men and which no man can resist. If religion can be traced to such premises, it becomes truly philosophical. But to rest it upon propositions which appear to be doubted by sane minds is, until that

appearance is proved to be illusory, a procedure which, even if philosophically shown to be worthy of a rational being, nevertheless fails to satisfy that impulse in man which gives rise to science and philosophy. Mr. James, therefore, whose doctrine has "no other voucher but what it finds in every man's unforced delight in the truth," has no right to call his work philosophy. The very distinction between reality and fiction rests on the fact that our taking delight in a belief is, in itself, no sign that the thing believed in is true.

Though deficient in argumentation, the book contains some interesting philosophical doctrines. The most prominent of these is a theory of the relation of matter and form. The form is represented as the archetypal, creative idea; the matter as that in virtue of which a thing attains actual existence. The former gives the thing all its qualities, the latter its mere quantity. The form is the essential element which belongs to the thing even in its mere potentiality; the matter is the element of actuality, which is merely contingent. So far the view is sufficiently familiar. But it is less usual to add, as Mr. James does, that since actuality is only the bringing of a thing into the realm of possible experience, while the potential essence is eternal and absolute, therefore the form is the real and objective element, while the matter is phenomenal and subjective. Moreover, the matter is not only in Aristotelian fashion made the generic element which the form differentiates, but also the principle of individuation (a doctrine maintained by very few). In the case of man, the matter is what sets him off from God and gives him being in himself and consciousness, while the form is the Divine element in him, whereby he is brought back into harmony with his Creator; that is, it is his conscience of good and evil. The form is the element of love in man, the matter the element of self.

Distinct traces of the influence of Platonism upon Swedenborg appear in this philosophy. What Mr. James calls the form is the Platonic idea or form, and the doctrine that God is the highest idea or form, the idea of good, and the form of forms, belongs of course to Plato. The singular conception that form is from its nature living is decidedly Platonic. So also is making numerical unity to depend upon form, and quantity upon matter. The statement that matter, or what exists besides God, is nonentity, is made with equal clearness by Mr. James and by Plato. The doctrines that there is a spiritual perception which is at the same time an act of abstraction of quantities from qualities, that nature is a mere manifestation or revelation of the Divine idea, that this manifestation is, in some sense, an inverted one, that there is a world-soul or *maximus homo*, and that the divine part of the human soul corresponds to it, that the Divinity in the soul is to be com-

pared to the sun shining on the world, that our cognition of necessary truths is a sort of memory, are doctrines which are to be found both in this book and in Plato or Plotinus; though they doubtless occupy very different positions and have very different colors in the two theosophies.

We must fairly warn our readers that all the hard study we have devoted to an attempt to understand this book may have gone for nothing, for it is terribly difficult. Not to mention the fact that we have not the thread of close argumentation to guide us, Mr. James uses terms so peculiarly that we stumble at the commonest words, which often receive meanings apparently quite unrelated to those we are accustomed to attach to them. All philosophers use words in peculiar senses, but they usually define their terms at the outset, and that Mr. James seldom does; even when he does, his definition often only substitutes several mysterious symbols for one. In first opening the book we are puzzled at finding identity attributed to things of which it would seem more consonant to the general drift of the author's thought to deny it. But after being confounded repeatedly by such statements, we begin to see — or think we see — that Mr. James, by saying that A and B are identical, means little more than that they coexist in nature. In like manner we find it difficult to comprehend our author's opposition to idealism until he gives us as its synonyme, "the invention of the world of things-in-themselves." So incessant is this cryptic use of terms, that the reader finally comes to lose all assurance that the commonest word is used in a sense analogous to its usual one. We read of the social destiny of woman, but whether by woman is meant those singular creatures whom we ordinarily so designate, or whether man is not meant, or some faculty of the mind, or merely the Aristotelian matter, is a question far beyond our humble powers. It is true that Mr. James supplies us with a synonyme for "woman," namely, "vir"; but it must be allowed that this does not in itself fully clear up the difficulty. On page 49 there is an attempt to explain the words male and female. "Male and female; *that is to say*, organic and functional, static and dynamic, generic and specific, universal and particular, public and private, outward and inward, common and proper, objective and subjective." From this we should incline to think that form was intended by woman. But a little below we find another definition: "Woman as woman or, what is the same thing, ... the subjective . . . . and moral content of human nature." This inclines us to think that by woman is meant a certain faculty of the mind. But further on we read of "the *minimus homo*, the moral or conscious Eve, the petty, specific, domestic *vir* of our actual bosoms, who embraces in himself the entire spiritual world, the universe of affection and thought, and to

whom all the facts of life, i. e. all the events of history, great and small, public and private, and all the results of experience, good and evil, true and false, exclusively pertain." A missionary from China some years ago, on his return to this country, in order to illustrate the difficulty of making the Chinese comprehend Christianity, told how the "inner man" throughout the New Testament is supposed by the Chinese to mean the woman, it being the idiom in their language. This seemed to us at the time to argue want of acquaintance with Chinese on the part of the translators; yet here is Mr. James, to whom English is vernacular, whose English is extraordinarily idiomatic and racy, who yet constantly, without any explanation, but as the most natural thing in the world, uses woman and inward man as synonymous. We cannot, however, close without saying that it is our firm conviction that this book can be understood by the right mind with the right preparation, and that, to many a man who cannot fully understand it, it will afford, as it has to us, much spiritual nutriment.

LIST OF SOME RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. Society and Solitude. Twelve Chapters. By Ralph Waldo Emerson. Boston: Fields, Osgood, & Co. 1870. 12mo. pp. 300.

2. Studies in Church History. The Rise of the Temporal Power. Benefit of Clergy. Excommunication. By Henry C. Lea. Philadelphia: Henry C. Lea. 1870. 8vo. pp. 515.

3. A Manual of the Ancient History of the East to the Commencement of the Median Wars. By François Lenormant and E. Chevallier. Vol. I. Comprising the History of the Israelites, Egyptians, Assyrians, and Babylonians. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1869. 12mo. pp. 539.

4. The Land-War in Ireland: A History for the Times. By James Godkin, late Irish Correspondent of "The Times." London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1870. 8vo. pp. 436.

5. Essays designed to elucidate the Science of Political Economy. By Horace Greeley. Boston: Fields, Osgood, & Co. 1870. 12mo. pp. 384.

6. The Life of Mary Russell Mitford. Edited by the Rev. A. G. K. L'Estrange. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1870. 2 vols. 12mo. pp. 378, 365.

7. Salem Witchcraft and Cotton Mather: A Reply. By Charles W. Upham. Morrisania, N. Y. 1869. 8vo. pp. 91.

8. The History of Rome. By Theodor Mommsen. Translated by the Rev. Wm. P. Dickson, D. D. Vol. II. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1870. 12mo. pp. 568.

9. The Composition of Indian Geographical Names, illustrated from the Algonkin Languages. By J. Hammond Trumbull. Hartford: Case, Lockwood, and Brainard. 1870. 8vo. pp. 51.

INDEX

TO THE

HUNDRED AND TENTH VOLUME

OF THE

North American Review.

Ancient Creed, an, 82–116.

Carlyle on the English poor, 334 — on habit, 405.

Coup d'État, Louis Napoleon's, Tenot's history of, 377–398.

Creed, an Ancient, article on, 82–116 — account of the stones found by Sir Walter Elliott, 82 — Mr. Fergusson's theories about Aryans and Turanians, 83, 84 — some reasons for the wide-spread worship of the snake, 84, 85 — connection between serpent-worship and human sacrifices, 85, 86 — Mr. Fergusson's theory of the origin of snake-worship in Egypt, 87–89 — tree and serpent worship in Greek mythology, 90–92 — representation of serpents on coins, 93 — traces of the ancient creed in Germany, 93, 96 — Mr. Fergusson denies that the serpent was ever worshipped in the British Isles, 97 — does not admit Stonehenge and Avebury to be Druidical temples, 98 — traces of serpent-worship in Northeast Scotland, 98, 99 — emblem of the cross found among several nations previous to their conversion to Christianity, 99 — serpent-worship exists to-day in Africa, 100 — its existence in America before time of Columbus, 100 — Mr. Fergusson's interpretation of the story of the trees of knowledge and of life, in Genesis, 101, 102 — no mention of serpent or tree worship in connection with Abraham or his immediate descendants, 103 — their worship clearly indicated in time of Moses, 103 — the brazen serpent of Moses worshipped for six centuries, 103, 104 — the Ophites of early Christian times, 105 — snake-worship in Persia, 106, 107 — in Cashmere, 107 — in Cambodia, its great temple, 107, 108 — the Bo-tree of Ceylon, 108 — difficulty of ascertaining the early forms of religion in India, 109 — the heroes of the Mahâ-Bhârata, and its fables of a serpent-race, 110 — snake-worship still prevalent in some parts of India, 111 — Buddhism a revival of superstitions of the aboriginal races of India, 111 — Buddha of purely Aryan origin, 112 — tree-worship an important part of Buddhism, snake-worship at first rejected, afterward an essential element, 113 — chaitya caves and topes, 113, note — the snake in Indian architecture, 113, 114 — modern architecture Aryan, stone architecture Turanian, 114–116.

Darwinism in Germany, article on, 284–299 — leading contributions to the Development Theory made in last fifteen years in England, 284 — Goethe's indication of the scientific drift of this half-century, 284, 285 — Oken's and Kant's suggestions, 286 — origin of the term "Natural Selection," 287 — Europe prepared for Darwin's theory by Lyell's geological works, 288 — great scientific value of Darwin's treatise, 289 — general acceptance of his views by scientific thinkers, 290 — delight of German atheists in them, 290–295 — their positiveness in asserting what Darwin only considers possible, or at most probable, 291 — the anthropoid apes, 292 — physical likeness and spiritual unlikeness of the Bushman and the gorilla, 293, 294 — supernatural power may have been inserted at the point where mind first appeared, 295 — Darwin not an atheist, 295, 296 — the Paleyan theory of creation not valid, 296 — the most wonderful machinery of nature must be accounted for, 297 — even atheists confess that progress is the law of the world, 297 — the Darwinian conception of a Creator not lacking in dignity and majesty, 298.

Ecclesiastical Crisis, The, in England, article on, 151–208 — the Liberal leaders insisted that the Irish and English establishments were entirely independent of each other, 151 — bigoted action of the English clergy, 152–155 — rejection of Peel, Gladstone, and Sir Roundell Palmer, by Oxford, 154 — efficiency and beneficence of Gladstone's disestablishment

bill, 155 — general decadence of the principle of State churches, 157–162 — conservative political record of the clergy, 162–165 — their opposition to a national system of secular education, 165, 166 — their influence in maintaining unjust university tests, 166, 167 — their social usefulness in country parishes, 168, 169 — Church of England, as Chatham said, has Calvinistic Articles and a Popish Liturgy, 170 — characteristics of the Evangelical party, 171–174 — its corruption by Lord Palmerston, 174–176 — the Ritualist party, 177–196 — its origin and growth at Oxford, 177, 178 — "Young England," 179 — J. H. Newman, 180–186 — Dr. Pusey, 186, 187 — confessional, monasticism, 188, 189 — utter untenableness of the Ritualist position, 189–192 — the Broad-Church party, 196–208 — its essential characteristic, rationalism, 196 — Dr. Hampden its author, 199 — Dean Milman, Mr. Robertson, Dean Stanley, 200 — Mr. Jowett, Dr. Temple, Mr. Maurice, 201 — "Essays and Reviews," 201–203 — Dr. Colenso's books, 203 — Mr. Mansel's suicidal theory, 204 — litigation against Broad-Churchmen, 205–208.

Ellis, Alexander J., his Early English Pronunciation, critical notice of, 420–437.

England, the ecclesiastical crisis in, 151–208 — Norman Conquest of, 349–377.

Freeman, E. A., his History of the Norman Conquest reviewed, 349–377.

Gladstone, his fertility in theories for justifying the existence of the English establishment, 151.

Great West, Parkman's Discovery of, reviewed, 260–284.

Hazlitt, W. Carew, his Library of Old Authors, critical notice of, 444–463.

Indian Migrations, article on, 33–82 — knowledge now possessed of Indian languages, 34 — identity of Indian systems of consanguinity, 34, 35 — Algonkin migrations, 35–43 — Atlantic nations, 36, 37 — Great Lake Nations, 37–39 — Mississippi nations, 39–41 — Rocky Mountain nations, 42, 43 — Dakota migrations, 43–54 — Dakotas, 43, 44 — Asiniboines, 44 — Missouri nations, 45 — Winnebagoes, 46 — Upper Missouri nations, 46–50 — no direct evidence respecting the country from which the Dakotas came, 47, 48 — probable course of their migrations, 48–50 — Hodenosaunian nations, 51–54 — reasons for classing them as a branch of the Dakotan stock, 51–53 — migrations of the Gulf nations, 54, 55 — of the Prairie nations, 55 — Shoshonee migrations, 55–58 — Athapasco, Apache migrations, 58, 59 — Village Indians of New Mexico and Arizona, 59, 60 — of Mexico and Central America, 61–67 — traditions of certain tribes concerning their last migrations, 62–67 — mound-builders, 67, 68 — Eskimo, 69 — summing up of the evidence indicating the Valley of the Columbia as the source of the Indian population of North and South America, 69–78 — discussion of the question of Asiatic origin of the Indian family, 78–82.

James, Henry, his Secret of Swedenborg critical notice of, 463–468.

Janus, his The Pope and the Council, critical notice of, 438–444.

Legal-Tender Act, The, article on, 299–327 — relative duties of private and of public citizens, 300 — we must assume at the outset that the Legal-Tender Act was not necessary, 300, 301 — prevalent financial ignorance among officers of the Government at the time of its enactment, 302 — Thaddeus Stevens's unfitness to direct the economical policy of the country, 302 — Mr. Spaulding's qualifications, 303, 304 — the Legal-Tender Act not necessary when enacted, 304–311 — Mr. Spaulding's objections to selling government bonds at market price, 307 — his letter on necessity of the Legal-Tender Act, 308 — Mr. Hooper, Mr. Bingham, Mr. Stevens, and Senator Sherman's views of its necessity, 310, 311 — only two modes for a government to obtain money, — to take, or borrow, 312 — principles which regulate loans, 312, 313 — Mr. Grinnell's opinion of Mr. Gallatin's opposition to a Legal-Tender Act, 314 — government "shining" in Wall Street, 314, 315 — cause of Mr. Chase's consenting to Mr. Spaulding's bill, 315, 316 — debate in the House of Representatives, 316–321 — Mr. Spaulding's speech, 317 — Mr. Bingham's, 319 — Mr. Stevens's and Mr. Shellabarger's, 320 — the opponents, 321 — debate in the Senate, — Mr. Fessenden, 322 — Mr. Collamer and Mr. Sumner, 323 — Mr. Spaulding's responsibility, 324 — double misfortune that Mr. Chase, as Secretary of Treasury, adopted the course he did, 325 — no evidence that the war might not have been successfully carried through without recourse to legal-tender paper, 325, 326.

Let-Alone Principle, The, article on, 1–33 — inability of men to see what constitutes individual liberty, 1 — the let-alone principle either a declaration of rights, or a maxim of policy, 1, 2 — the natural rights of man, and their modifications by society, 2, 3 — limitation of rights to gifts of nature, by the equal rights of others, 3, 4 — by voluntary obligations, 4 — by taxation, 4 — examination of the necessity of taxation, 4–7 — "protective duty" defined and condemned, 7, 8 — usury laws a relic of barbarism, 8 — legal-tender laws, 8–10 — real points at issue between friends and foes of freedom in government and trade, 10, 11 — two points on which the let-alone prin-

ciple is based, 11, 12 — arguments from these propositions, against protection, 12–24 — the iron industry, 14, 15 — witty petition of Bastial, 15, 16 — arbitrary distinction made by protectionists between natural and artificial products, 17 — why we cannot compete with the cheap labor of Europe, 23, 24 — the policy of usury laws, 24–27 — the currency question viewed in the light of the let-alone principle, 27–33.

Maine's Ancient Law quoted, 351–360.

Migrations, Indian, 33–82.

Newman, J. H., his intellectual and moral characteristics, 180–186.

Norman Conquest, The, of England, article on, 349–377 — Mr. Freeman's high qualities as an historian, 350 — his contributions to comparative jurisprudence, 350, 351 — variety of form assumed by the same primitive institutions in different countries, 351, 352 — patriarchal character of early institutions, 353 — division of people into two classes in Rome and in England, 354 — relation of eorls and ceorls to each other and to the commonwealth, 354 — constitution of the Witenagernot, 355 — nature of the Anglo-Saxon kingship, 356 — rules of inheritance to the throne, 357 — the early date and steady continuance of English liberties, 357, 358 — nature of the Norman Conquest, 360, 361 — compared with the three earlier conquests, 362 — the Heptarchy, 362 — how the country came to be called England, 363 — the continuousness of English history, 365 — imperial titles assumed by the early kings of England, 366, 367 — relation of Scotland to England, 367, 368 — Anglo-Saxons, 368, 369 — marked differences between them and the Normans, 370 — feudalism, 370–372 — political and social changes wrought in England by the Norman Conquest, 372, 373 — growth and overthrow of the German Empire, 374 — relation between William the Conqueror and the papal see, 375, 376.

Palmer, Sir Roundell, why rejected by Oxford, 154.

Parkman's Discovery of the Great West, article on, 260–284 — wisdom of Mr. Parkman's method of writing the history of French discovery, colonization, and dominion in North America, 260 — deficiency in this department of our historical literature, 261 — variety and extent of French enterprise in this country, 261–263 — materials for Mr. Parkman's history, 263, 264 — Nicollet's discovery of the Winnebagoes, 266 — La Salle, 267 — story of his expeditions to Ohio, Illinois, and the Mississippi, 268–281 — Father Claude Allouez's mission at Green Bay, 271 — Father Marquette, his chivalrous devotion, adventures, and death, 272–275 — La Salle's expedition with Beaujeu to take possession of the mouth of the Mississippi, 282, 283.

Physics and Physiology of Spiritualism, 233–260.

Political Art, The Prospects of, article on, 398–419 — nature of political liberty, 398 — political history of the world made up almost exclusively of disputes about the seat of sovereignty, 399 — sovereignty a means, not an end, 400 — progress in legislation, 400 — scanty contributions made to the science of government since the Roman Empire, 401–403 — causes of the slow progress of scientific legislation, 404–411 — force of custom, 405, 406 — ignorance of human nature, 407 — this nature different in masses of men from what it is in individual men, 408 — ascertained tendencies of society, 409 — European ideal of the State just after the Middle Ages, 409 — difference between old-school and new-school legislators, 411 — present ease and skill in collecting and arranging statistics, 412 — unconscious assimilation going on among all civilized states, 412 — conscious assimilation, 413 — comparative legislation, 414 — parliamentary legislation, 415 — its inadequacy as now managed, 416 — outlook for future legislation, 417–419.

Poverty and Public Charity, article on, 327–349 — public charity a duty, 328 — Edward Livingston's Louisiana penal code, 328 — poverty the condition of the great majority of the American people before 1820, 328, 329 — first charitable and penal establishments founded in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, 330 — results of Josiah Quincy's study of the question of pauperism in Massachusetts, 331 — condition and system of Massachusetts previous to 1863, 331–333 — condition and number of poor in England and on the European continent, 334, 335 — poverty not increasing in United States, 336 — decrease of pauperism in Massachusetts since 1863, 336–339 — virtual decrease in New York City, 340 — large percentage of foreign-born or children of foreign-born parents among present paupers, 341 — methods adopted in Massachusetts for reducing the number of the dependent classes to a minimum, 343 — the New York City Board of Charities and Correction, and the Massachusetts State Board of Charities, 344 — deaf-mute education in Massachusetts, 345 — what the Massachusetts Board has done and aims to do, 345, 346 — the Visiting Agency, and its excellent effects, 346, 347 — Reports of different State Boards, 347, 348.

Pumpelly, Raphael, his Across America and Asia, critical notice of, 224–228.

Railway Problems in 1869, article on, 116–150 — immediate effect of Congress granting aid to Pacific Railroad, 116 —

mysterious Credit Mobilier, and its connection with the Pacific Railroad, 117 — danger of fostering special interests by legislation, 118 — experience of Massachusetts from 1836 to 1869, 119, 120 — railroad consolidations consequent upon completion of Pacific Railroad, 120–123 — extension of Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, 121 — Pennsylvania Central, 121, 122 — Erie, 122 — New York Central, 122, 123 — neutralization of the American policy concerning entail, by the growth of railroad corporations, 124 — points of likeness between the railroad system and the Roman Catholic church, 125 — demoralizing political tendency of the system, 127 — development of the American Express system, 128 — its encroachments upon the legitimate business of railroads, 129 — "time freights," — Blue, Red, and White Lines, 130, 131 — competition the bane of railways and an injury to the public, 132, 133 — necessity of combination among railroads, and the dangerous power resulting therefrom, 134–137 — "stock-watering" in 1869, 137–145 — extent of freight business, 145, 146 — policy of having railroads owned by government, 146, 147 — conflict between government and vast corporations, 148–150.

Recent Publications, List of some, 468.

Spiritualism, The Physics and Physiology of, article on, 233–260 — healthy scepticism of supernatural agencies, developed by intelligence, 233 — phenomena of spiritualism of such a character as to impress profoundly the credulous and ignorant, 234 — possibility of careful and experienced judgment being deceived by false sensorial impressions of real objects, 234, 240 — by non-existent images created by the mind, 235 — nature of animal electricity, 236 — the mind, what it is, and where located, 236, 237 — Reichenbach's theory of magnetic influences, *od*, 237–240 — no proof that magnetism produces the clairvoyant state, causes raps, etc., 240 — legerdemain in many cases of supposed spiritualism, 241 — somnambulism, 241–250 — different kinds, 242 — instance of natural somnambulism, 242–244 — of artificial, 245 — voluntary hypnotism, 246–250 — hysteria, and the analgesic condition induced by it, 250–253 — a sufficient explanation of some phenomena usually considered the result of spiritual agency, 253, 254 — catalepsy and ecstasy, 255–258 — no proof yet adduced of the agency of spirits, 258, 259 — Algazzali's description of his search for actual knowledge, 259.

Tenot's Coup d'État, article on, 377–398 — who M. Tenot is, 377 — previous memoirs of the Coup d'État, 378 — Louis Philippe's reign and abdication, 379 — the Republican Constitution, 380 — Louis Napoleon's return to Paris, 382 — his election as President, 383 — successive ruptures between him and the Assembly, 383, 384 — revision of the Constitution to render his re-election impossible, 384 — different parties in 1850, 385 — changes of ministers, 386 — failure of the "questor's proposition," 386 — the President's special confidants, — De Morny, 387 — De Persigny and Colonel Fleury, 388 — preparation to make General St. Arnaud Minister of War, 389 — President's reception on the night of December 1, 1851, 390 — principal features of the *coup d'état*, 390 — printing the President's proclamations, 390 — occupation of the Assembly Palace, and arrest of prominent men, 391 — purport of the proclamations, 392 — mode and incidents of the arrest of recusant members of Assembly, 393 — barricades, death of Baudin, 394 — De Maupas frightened out of his wicked wits, 395 — De Morny's plan for crushing opposition, and its bloody success, 396 — the *coup d'état* complete, 396 — subsequent history of leading men on either side, 397 — popularity of M. Tenot's work, 398.

Treasury Reports, The, article on, 209–223 — laws of finance invariable and universal, 209 — impolicy of taxing the country to get out of debt immediately, 209, 210 — illustrated by English financial experience, 210 — difficulty of placing a 4½ per cent loan, 211 — basis of the theory of currency, 213 — degree of contraction necessary, 214 — our double currency, — greenbacks, and national bank-notes, 215 — arguments of the Comptroller of the Currency against greenbacks, 217, 218 — feasible mode of distributing and controlling the government currency through an Office of Issue, 220–222 — illustrated in history of Bank of England, 222 — difficulty of securing judicious legislation on the subject by Congress, 223.

Tree and Serpent Worship, 82–116.

Wesley's relation to the Church of England, 171.

Whitney, J. D., his Geological Survey of California, critical notice of, 228–232.

Yosemite Guide-Book, notice of, 228–232.

Cambridge: Printed by Welch, Bigelow, and Company.

Boston Public Library
Central Library, Copley Square

Division of
Reference and Research Services

The Date Due Card in the pocket indicates the date on or before which this book should be returned to the Library.

Please do not remove cards from this pocket.

Mar 17 1914